GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENERGY PARTNERSHIP

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

This public hearing in the above matter was held on March 26, 2007, at 6:00 p.m., at the Hood River Inn, 1108 East Marina Way, Hood River, Oregon.

BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES
Certified Shorthand Reporters
P. O. Box 223
Pendleton, Oregon 97801
(541) 276-9491 (800) 358-2345

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Mr. Brown, the facilitator, makes introductory statements followed by a video presentation).

MR. BROWN: I am now pleased to introduce Mr. Furstenau, who is the Deputy Manager for Nuclear Energy, DOE's Idaho operations office.

He will discuss the background of the project and the purpose and basic elements of the proposed PEIS.

MR. FURSTENAU: Thank you. On behalf of the Department of Energy, I welcome and appreciate everyone attending this public scoping meeting tonight.

Again my name is Ray Furstenau. And I represent the Office of Nuclear Energy in the U.S. Department of Energy.

(A slide presentation is presented).

MR. FURSTENAU: Next slide. This is the general outline I will be discussing tonight. I have a little bit on the nuclear power basics for those of you who may not be familiar.

It's describing the concept of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, the proposed GNEP

facilities, the National Environmental Policy Act, and the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement process for GNEP.

Nuclear power basics. As many of you may know, nuclear power in the U.S. provides about 20 percent of the U.S. base load of electricity.

Nuclear reactors do not emit air pollution. Greenhouse gases provide, to date, 70 percent of the emission-free generation electricity.

The schematic shows you the basics of how a power reactors works. You have the -- the uranium fuel basically acts as the heat source.

The heat source to heat water, runs through a secondary cooling cycle to boil water in a steam generator, which runs steam through a turbine and generates electricity.

In the U.S., there's two general types of light water reactors, which is the pressurized water reactor and the other types of boiling water reactor.

And there's 103 operating reactors in the U.S. today. And all of them are the light water reactor types. With GNEP we plan to recycle the fuel coming out of these light water reactors.

Next slide. Currently after completing and operating the cycle, it's typically 18 to 24 months,

some of the uranium fuel is considered used or spent must be replaced with fresh fuel.

The two approaches to spent fuel management are the open cycle or once-through cycle as it's sometimes called, it goes once-through for ultimate disposal.

This is the current approach, but there's still lots of energy left. And then closed cycle or recycled approach, and that's part of what the GNEP proposal is about.

Next slide. The worldwide electricity demand is expected to approximately double by 2030. And in the U.S., the increase is expected to be about 50 percent in that same time frame.

So the U.S. is pursuing ways to increase energy from diverse sources in ways that protect and improve the environment and enhance our nation's energy security.

The present Advanced Energy Initiative really looks at three ways to meet challenges of generating more electricity.

One of those is with, pretty much, nuclear power. And another is clean coal technology. And then the third is renewable such as wind and solar.

Next slide. This map shows the energy,

nuclear energy use in the world today by a number of reactors.

And one thing to point out on the slide, the U.S. has 103 operating reactors. It's still the largest in the world, even though there hasn't been a new reactor order for many years. And there's 28 in construction around the world.

And based on this source, there's 222 planned. So the point is to show that internationally nuclear power expansion is underway.

Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, why, why do it, and why now. As I mentioned before, there's a rapidly expanding global demand for nuclear power.

And without some way to -- some partnership to manage this expansion, the potential exists for spreading of enrichment and reprocessing technologies. This is the proliferation concerns that we have.

A global partnership is developing right now among Russia, France, Japan, and China. All those counties have both the will and the means to participate.

The United States, through GNEP, is leading the formation of this partnership. Right now we do not have the means to participate in its execution.

And unless we implement domestic aspects,

which I'll talk about here shortly, we will suffer significant consequences in our own energy security, of our industrial competitiveness, and our national security.

There are also potential repository benefits from the GNEP concept, but the international need itself is compelling.

The U.S. must act decisively and quickly to implement GNEP or face the real possibility of having no influence over the certain future global expansion of nuclear energy.

Some of the key elements of the U.S. nuclear energy strategy and international initiatives are depicted in these three bullets.

One is to establish supply arrangements to provide reliable fuel services worldwide; to develop, demonstrate, deploy advanced, proliferation resistant nuclear power reactors for the power grids in developing countries.

Not all counties need the same sort of large base electricity generating plants that we use in the U.S. Some need smaller reactors that can be used for smaller power grids. Maybe use them for process heat or for some utilization of water.

Also an important point is in cooperation

with the International Atomic Energy Agency, enhance nuclear safeguards to effectively and efficiently monitor nuclear materials in facilities.

And this can be accomplished in design with the new facilities that we're thinking about building with the GNEP concept.

Next slide. The domestic efforts is to expand nuclear power to meet our growing energy demand and in an environmentally sustainable manner and to develop and demonstrate deploy advanced technologies for recycling spent fuel in manners that do not separate pure plutonium.

Also we plan to demonstrate and deploy and develop advanced reactors that can consume or destroy transuranic elements from the recycled spent fuel while generating new power.

Now a little bit on the discussion of the facilities being proposed under the GNEP concept. DOE is evaluating three fuel cycle facilities to support the domestic part of GNEP.

One's the Nuclear Fuel Recycling Center. That facility will separate spent fuel into reusable components, including uranium and transuranics and non-reusable constituents without separating pure plutonium. And again, the point of not separating out

pure plutonium is the proliferation concerns.

Also this facility will fabricate fuel from the transuranics that will be used in the Advanced Recycling Reactor.

The PEIS will analyze the alternative technologies and alternative fuel throughputs, anywhere from a hundred to 3,000 metric tons annually.

The next facility, the Advanced Recycling Reactor, it will be designed to destroy the transuranics while generating electricity. Proposed technology is sodium cold fast reactor.

It's different than the light water reactors that I spoke about earlier. It's much more efficient at destroying the transuranic elements. And PEIS will analyze power ratings from 250 to 2,000 megawatts thermal for this reactor.

And the last facility to be considered is the Advanced Fuel Cycle Research Facility. It's supporting research and development related to separations technology and the fabrication of fast reactor transmutation fuel, long-term research and development needs for technologies beyond the GNEP concepts as well. This will be built and operated by DOE at a DOE site.

This pictorially represents what I spoke

about in this meeting earlier, the light water reactor spent fuel in the upper circle, upper left-hand circle comes in.

There's a certain amount of process storage that's used as feedstock into the spent fuel, nuclear fuel separations facility.

It separates out the transuranics and uranium to feed into an Advanced Fuel Cycle Facility that would fabricate the transmutation fuels.

And those fuels would then be provided to a sodium fast reactor that would then burn the transuranics as fuel and destroy the transuranics that are currently a problem in the light water fuel that's not recycled.

And then that fuel out of the sodium fast reactor comes back and it is also recycled. So it's a continuous cycle.

What you see leaving the large circle is excess uranium. And in that excess uranium, that's about over 93 percent of the product coming out of the used fuel from reactors today.

So there's still a lot of good material left, left in the fuel that comes out of the reactors in the once-through cycle.

And also the robust waste forms. And the

representation of this is that in these facilities, the waste will be leaving those facilities in a solid waste form. There will be no large quantities of stored liquid waste. It will all be in a solid waste form.

And it's a good stage for that. We can design that into the facilities today. We've learned a lot in the last 50 years, and we plan to incorporate lessons learned in the design of these facilities.

And kind of a separation down the middle, going from top to bottom. At a production scale, again, the Advanced Fuel Cycle Research Facility is more of an R&D facility.

In a commercial facility, you may be able to make the closed fuel cycle with the Spent Nuclear Fuel Separations Facility and the sodium fast reactor, you could build the transmutation fuel fabrication into the spent nuclear fuel separations.

Next slide. The NEPA process, I'd like to speak to you briefly about that. I think you can see the "You are here" arrow. Right in the scoping public process, that's where we're about right now.

This is the 13th and final public scoping meeting that we've conducted over the past two months or so.

It all started with an advanced notice of intent in March of 2006. And we received some comments on that advanced notice of intent and incorporated to that, incorporated comments into that notice of intent that was issued in January of 2007.

The next step in the process is the development of a Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. We're planning to finish that this summer. And that will also go out for public comment.

And that public comment will be the fall of 2007. The final EIS in late spring of 2008. With the record of decision in the summer of 2008.

Next slide. The purpose of the EIS, the programmatic EIS is assessing reasonable alternatives that want to encourage expansion of nuclear energy production; reduce nuclear proliferation risks; and, three, reduce the volume, thermal output and radiotoxicity of spent fuel for disposal in a geological repository.

Domestic alternatives that will be looked at in the PEIS, Alternative 1 is the no action alternative. That's the once-through cycle that we're using right now.

It's continuing the status quo in which commercial light water reactors generate and store

spent fuel until DOE can dispose of it in a geological repository.

And also part of that no action alternative will continue the research and development that's being done on nuclear fuel cycle.

Alternative 2, the GNEP proposed action would be a broad implication of a closed fuel cycle that it could include one or more Nuclear Fuel and Recycling Centers and one or more Advanced Recycling Reactors.

And under this alternative, there are many possible possibilities and combinations that could occur from this.

Next slide. The site alternatives. Last year, DOE issued a funding opportunity announcement where Mr. Spurgeon referred to when we were putting together for sites that may be interested in hosting one or more of the facilities.

These site studies, the awards that these were made, about $10 million to 11, are a consortia for these sites. He said those were announced in January of this year.

And we're excepting these sites, that needs to be completed by the first of May. And once those siting studies were done, it will be made available to

the public.

The DOE sites that you see here on the left, there's 13 sites altogether. And then there's the -- included in that are five non-DOE sites.

Next slide. This kind of presents in a little bit of a different form with the DOE and non-DOE sites on the left-hand side and which facilities that are being considered for, across in the columns, the facilities that weren't part of the GNEP siting.

ANL, which is the Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago and the LA, land facility, which is the Los Alamos National Laboratory, those are being considered for the R&D facility because they are DOE sites, but they're not being considered for the Nuclear Fuel Recycling Center and the Advanced Recycling Reactor.

Next slide. Closer to home here, the GNEP proposed site alternatives, our Hanford site in Washington, it is a DOE site.

It was identified by DOE as a potential site for the Advanced Fuel Cycle Research Facility and it was also proposed by TRIDEC, the Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council and the Columbia Basin Consulting Group in response to a funding opportunity

announcement. And they are doing a siting study, that's due by the first of May.

In that proposal, they are looking at siting with the Nuclear Fuel Recycling Center and the Advanced Recycling Rector.

Next slide. The key international GNEP initiatives give you a perspective of the fuel services program, showing the availability of nuclear fuel to nations that refrain from reprocessing uranium enrichment and reactor programs that promote proliferation resistant reactors.

From a PEIS perspective, we'll be looking at only a general qualitative analysis of the potential impacts on the U.S. or the global cons that might be involved in such activities.

In the GNEP Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, among the environmental issues we'll be looking at are listed here.

And a record of decision, in that record of decision DOE will determine whether to proceed with the construction and operation of the GNEP recycling facilities, and if so may address what technologies and capabilities to utilize as well as identification of qualified locations.

DOE's decision will be based on input from

the PEIS as well as cost, technical, and policy information.

Next slide. How can you help us in making a sound decision? Provide comments, continue to be informed. There's a lot of information on our website. And continue to be involved.

Sign up for our distribution lists, when the Programmatic Environmental Impact Draft comes out. And attend public meetings when we conduct them for the Draft PEIS.

And how to provide your comments. You can do them here tonight either orally or record. You can sent them to us by mail. You can send them by e-mail, by telephone, or by fax. And the comment period ends April 4th.

Thank you for your attention tonight. And we look forward to your comments.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Since this is a scoping hearing tonight in which we're supposed to comment on potential impacts of proposed actions, I'm wondering why you have not presented a single word and there isn't a single piece of paper describing the size of reprocessing facilities proposed for Hanford, the number of reactors and their size, how much spent nuclear fuel will be imported to

Hanford. If it's coming from overseas, what ports will be used.

If we can't hear how much spent nuclear fuel would be imported, how can you expect the public to comment on the question of what are the proposed impacts of the proposed alternatives?

You haven't even said what the size of the nuclear reactors proposed by the applicant are for Hanford.

MR. BROWN: Let me just react to that. This is a scoping meeting. I think you're signed up to speak, is that correct?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And I think that's the sort of comment that you should make.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This is point to --

(Public members speaking over each other).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's supposed to be information presented in these meetings on the specifics for each site, what is proposed. Where is that?

And how can the public find out what's specifically proposed to the Hanford site before they --

MR. BROWN: Well, that's a legitimate comment. And I hope you will make that when we have the comment period.

I would expect that that's the sort of thing that DOE would respond to when they put out the draft materials.

We are scheduled at the conclusion of this presentation to take a break to ask more questions. And why don't you pose that question to the Department of Energy staff here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's standing right there.

MR. BROWN: That's correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why doesn't he answer to the public? (Inaudible).

MR. BROWN: We are going to adjourn now for questions. Please pose that question, and then you'll have an opportunity to follow up with comments. Thank you.

When we reconvene, I will lay out the ground rules for the public comment. This is an opportunity, if you didn't have it up to this point, to review materials. You can also pose questions to DOE staff. We'll have about five or ten minutes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who are the DOE

staff? Where are they?

MR. BROWN: DOE staff, if you will put your hands up, DOE staff.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you answer Gerald's question? I think we'd all like to hear the answer to it.

MR. FURSTENAU: You must understand where we are in the process. Jerry's a lawyer, he's trying to bring points of order in that are not relevant to this scoping process.

Now, for the specifics that are going -- where we were in the process right now, for instance Hanford. We have not come to a conclusion whether Hanford will be a site in any event.

Once it survives a screening process, all of this was up on the slides, then we will get to the specifics that Jerry wants in terms of the size of the reactor, the size of the repossessing plant.

We told you about a range that we're considering. And that's the range that we're considering in the scoping process.

We're not yet to those final decisions, that's the scoping process.

We have a big crowd here tonight. Please hold off your comments until you make a statement.

MR. BROWN: DOE staff, again hold your hands up. If folks want to pose specific questions to them, there's an opportunity during this break. We will take a break and reconvene in about five or ten minutes. Thanks.

(A short recess was taken).

MR. BROWN: At this time we're going to receive your formal comments on the proposed PEIS. This is your opportunity to let DOE know what you would like to see addressed in the draft document. The court reporter will transcribe your statement.

Let me review a few ground rules for formal comments. Please step up to the microphone at the podium over there, (indicating), providing your name.

Introduce yourself, also with an organization affiliation where appropriate. If you have a written version of your statement, please provide a copy to the court reporter after you've completed your statement.

Also please give the court reporter any other additional materials that you would like to see included as part of the permanent record. They will be marked and submitted to the Department of Energy.

I will call two names at a time. The first, the speaker; and the second, the person to

follow. In view of the number of people who've indicated an interest in speaking, and I understand that there will be a bridge closing at I believe 9:30 or so, we're going to ask that you confine your statement to two minutes. I will let you know when you have a minute left.

What this will mean is if you can just summarize the key points that you would like to make. And then you can submit the remainder of the statement to the court reporter or of course you can submit statements in other forums up until April 4th.

However the statements are submitted, whether they're presented verbally or submitted in written form, they will count equally when they're being assessed by the Department of Energy.

Mr. Furstenau and Dick Black will serving as hearing officers during the public comment period.

So let me begin with some representatives of local and national elected officials. I will begin with Clifford Casseseka of the Yakima Nation.

Yes. If you'll be first, if you would like to be. And if you would step up to the microphone over there, (indicating). Thanks very much. And Ken Niles will follow.

MR. CASSESEKA: Thank you. My name is

Clifford Casseseka, Yakima Nation. The power point could be very interesting, but it only gives you detail of what they want you to hear; not really what people have put together as far as what's going on.

I would like to start out with the proposal. This proposal for transferring nuclear waste to Hanford, Yakima has -- what does it take to process the protocol with Yakima Nation.

Yakima Nation made a treaty with the United States Government, not with staff people, not with the DOE Department, but with the President of the United States. That's who we made the treaty with.

The Hanford site, when they started its process of developing nuclear waste, it has a lot of impact to the region: the environment; the human health; the agriculture; and the mighty Columbia River, it's contaminated.

The proposal that you're trying to present here to the people, that goes through I&I&D (phonetic).

We have what they call the gorge, there's a gap in the protection for the environment and human health.

We also, I believe, will be hearing from the Gorge Commission and the Gorge Commission Board.

The Gorge Commission will talk about this issue, it's a congressional mandate, it's a federal law.

There's a lot of process that you have to go through of finally talking to these people here that are very interested in what's going on.

MR. BROWN: And you have, I'm sorry, just about one minute left. If you can make a few final points.

MR. CASSESEKA: When you talk about the funding, who's going to get this funding. Since Hanford started their nuclear production, the people knew why they needed that funding. No compensation at all for anything.

And there is no guarantee that there will be no contamination. The Black Rock proposal damn is going to up the aquifers. And that will effect the Hanford site.

With the storage there at Hanford, how many years is it going to be stored before it's really used?

The Hanford site is in a cleanup process for how many years? Billions of dollars. And they still haven't cleaned it up yet. And yet you want to bring this nuclear waste to our area.

The area we're talking about at the Hanford

site is in the ceded lands of the Yakima Nation. And that's for the record.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

MR. CASSESEKA: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Ken Niles will be followed by Claude Oliver.

MR. NILES: Good evening. I'm Ken Niles. I'm the assistant director for the Oregon Department of Energy and here on behalf of the State of Oregon.

I want to first of all thank you, the U.S. Department of Energy, for acknowledging my agency's request for a scoping meeting in western Oregon.

Oregon and Oregonians have a longstanding interest in Hanford. And we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments in person to the department.

I thank all of you for attending. This is a great turnout. We appreciate your interest and your involvement.

Oregon has strong objections to using Hanford facilities and the Hanford site for GNEP activities.

Our objections are not antinuclear. Rather, we object to importing or producing large

amounts of new waste at Hanford while Hanford still has a very long way to go in order to -- (audience applauding over speaker).

It would take far more than the two minutes I've been allotted to thoroughly describe the level of contamination that exists at Hanford and the amount of environmental entry that has occurred at the site.

Hanford poses a very real long-term threat to the Columbia River. And a great deal more work must be done at Hanford to ensure that these future environmental impacts are not significant.

Hanford is a cleanup site. It will be involved with clean up for decades to come. That must remain the focus of Hanford.

This is not the right time to begin moving on to other things at Hanford. It is lunacy to suggest that bringing more waste and creating more waste at a site that has the immense environmental problems that exist at Hanford.

MR. BROWN: Just one minute left, sorry.

MR. NILES: A comment was made at a recent scoping meeting in Pasco that Hanford could walk and chew gum at the same time; that clean up can move forward in partnership with GNEP and may even

help clean up.

GNEP does, after all, make some very amazing claims in terms of its waste reduction. Pardon our skepticism, but when something sounds too good to be true, it's because it often is.

We ask the Department of Energy to not complicate the clean up at Hanford any more than it already is. The problems are already daunting enough. Do not bring GNEP to Hanford.

MR. OLIVER: Thank you. I'm Claude Oliver, Benton County Commissioner, but home of Hanford.

And I do appreciate your hospitality tonight, opening your house, your homes. And you folks coming out to a good meeting like this.

I think the process -- everybody's concerned about what kind of a process we have. I would love to see a panel of scientists up here, five, six, seven of the most brilliant minds in the nation that can answer your questions tonight for three or four, five hours; because you know what, you're entitled to have those kinds of answers. But this forum does not provide for that.

The forum is for your process of public input. And believe me, we have those questions in our

community as well.

One of those questions is involving Hanford vitrification, the plant that would glassify Hanford waste into logs.

You know, when that plant turns on, the approximate time that Yucca Mountain Valley is open is approximately three years.

And then Yucca Mountain is full, under the current technology, under the current scenario. So where does that high-left waste go.

My good friend from the state of Oregon, if you're volunteering to dig those last logs down here into a high-level repository, please let us know.

We want some answers. We need some answers. Just like everybody in this room needs some answers.

The GNEP program takes the process and it separates the waste volume. So you have some high level, some low level, and other materials that can be disposed of appropriately.

It also would allow a testing process with transmutated waste to show that the storage life required, going from thousands of years, would go down to a few hundred years.

And in this process, you could then make

Yucca work. Yucca would work just fine. If you don't have Yucca open and available, you've got either Yucca 2 or Yucca 3, at a cost of another 30-$40 billion.

So the GNEP program brings forward the opportunity to get answers. The answers that every person in this room is entitled to have.

MR. BROWN: You've got one minute left.

MR. OLIVER: Thank you very much.

I think we're all united in wanting answers. And my apologies that we don't have a panel of scientists up here to give you those answer tonight.

Be patient, those answers will come back in about 45 days, in terms of response to the testimony you're giving.

I would like to ask that the process as it evolves would do a cost comparison for the various GNEP approaches that can be done throughout the nation.

You know, there's $5 billion in facilities that you and I as taxpayers have already bought and paid for up at Hanford, ready to be plugged in on this program.

And then if you're concerned about your tax

dollars going forward, Jackson, Bakerson, Mike McCormmach, and Congressman Dick (phonetic) helped build them. And I think they were very visionary when they did that.

You plug in those assets and you use them. Right now with the GNEP program, without those assets, it costs another 10 billion from the taxpayers to build and another five to ten years to build.

You know, we need answers to energy today. We're in a crisis. The latest word from the Middle East is one more terrorist incident likely targeted at an oil facility will raise the price of a barrel of oil over a hundred dollars.

MR. BROWN: One more point, please.

MR. OLIVER: Thank you.

With that comment, let's get some answers. I appreciate your turnout tonight. I think you're entitled to answers like everyone is.

And let's try and encourage the Department of Energy to have a battery of scientists next time so we can ask questions and get answers right here tonight, right now. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: The next speaker is Mary -- is it Gautreaux, from Senator Wyden's office.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What county were

you with, sir?

MR. OLIVER: Benton County.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is that Washington?

MR. OLIVER: Kennewick, Pasco. Yes, it is. Senator Benton, when the states were created, has a lot of counties named on his behalf. We're one of them in Washington state. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: And Kathy Fitzpatrick will follow.

MS. GAUTREAUX: Thank you. My name is Mary Gautreaux. And I'm here on behalf of Senator Wyden, who couldn't be here tonight. So I would like to read a statement from him.

"The GNEP is yet another new strategy to keep Hanford as the nuclear waste capital of the Nation.

"Over some 45 years, Hanford produced some 74 tons of plutonium, first to make nuclear weapons and later as part of its continued operation of the reactor despite the fact that it was no longer needed.

"The results are well known to all. Some 1,600 identified waste sites. 53 million gallons of high-level waste stored in 177 underground tanks.

"Sixty-seven of those 177 tanks are

suspected to have leaked that waste into the soil. And the list goes on.

"What is amazing to me is that DOE is now trying to clean up the nuclear waste and environmental contamination for half as long as the site was actually in operation - more than 20 years - with no end in sight.

"We are now coming up on the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Tri-Party Agreement. And where are we?

"The high-level waste vitrification plant was supposed to be completed and in operation by 2011 according to the Tri-Party Agreement.

"And it is now being delayed another eight years and construction costs have more than doubled - from the 5.8 billion estimated in 2003 to this year's estimate of 12.3 billion. And the plan still leaves many questions unanswered.

"My point here is a simple one. DOE has not fulfilled its obligation to clean-up Hanford. It's not clear when it will.

"But now, DOE is proposing to bring more waste to Hanford - and this time in the form of spent nuclear fuel from commercial nuclear power plants. Hanford does not need more nuclear waste, it needs

less.

"I understand that DOE has a whole list of reasons why it thinks reprocessing spent fuel is a good idea - it will reduce the amount of waste that needs to go to a permanent repository and the length of time it will need to be there, that it will remove plutonium from spent fuel and thereby reduce the threat of proliferation, and yet it will create a new supply of fuel for the next generation of nuclear power plants that it hopes to build in the U.S."

MR. BROWN: One minute left.

MS. GAUTREAUX: "The truth is as we have seen at Hanford, that reprocessing spent fuel is like King Midas on steroids.

"When you start separating nuclear waste, everything it touches becomes radioactive, including the buildings you've built to do the reprocessing.

"It is simply not credible to argue that reprocessing reduces the amount of radioactive waste that will need to be handled.

"Second, it strains all creditability to think that a massive U.S. program to separate plutonium will somehow discourage other countries around the world who seek to build their own nuclear weapons programs from doing the same.

"Third, there is no evidence that there's any shortage of uranium to power future nuclear power plants.

"In short, DOE should not only reject siting the GNEP fuel reprocessing facilities at Hanford, DOE should consider the whole concept of GNEP. Thank you, Senator Wyden."

MR. BROWN: Kathy Fitzpatrick.

MS. FITZPATRICK: Hi. I'm Kathy Fitzpatrick. I'm the city council person for the City of Mosier. However, I'm here tonight as a very concerned citizen.

When I was in elementary school, my sixth grade teacher showed us a poster that was in the public in the 1950's, how top protect themselves from radiation.

It was a man with a hat on. And the title of the poster was Tip your Hat. So in other words, inform your public that to protect themselves from radiation, all they needed to do was tip their hat. And those posters on this side of the room really remind me of that poster of the man in the hat.

Granny D (phonetic) was here a few years ago and spoke to us about when she first became an activist. She was up in Alaska, visiting the

beautiful pristine bay.

The U.S. Government had just come in and told the inhabitants of that bay that they were going to enhance their fishing and their quality of life by dropping a nuclear bomb on the bay and that the Native Americans would be right back, three weeks later, fishing and living in their houses.

Now the same people are here tonight, the same people who created that poster. And who told those Native Americans that they would have a wonderful life if they were allowed to -- if the U.S. Government was allowed to drop that nuclear bomb in the bay.

And they're also asking us to believe that recycling nuclear waste is sort of like putting our cans and bottles on the curb in one box; and that they would be taken away, disappear magically to happily-ever-after land.

And that somehow separating the cans and the bottles would make them both disappear. So I think -- somehow I think that when you separate cans and bottles, you still have cans and bottles left over.

MR. BROWN: Sorry. About one minute left.

MS. FITZPATRICK: Last year I was invited to a DOE meeting, at which the DOE representatives basically told us that, one, there was not enough money in the world to clean up Hanford; and, two, there are no answers. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Our next speaker is Gerald Pollet.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Didn't he already speak?

MR. BROWN: He phrased a question. He has, like other folks, two minutes. And he will be followed by -- I think it's Jerry Peltier or Peltier.

MR. POLLET: Can you hold up a card instead of interrupting people, saying two minute, one minute up?

MR. BROWN: I can do that.

MR. POLLET: That would be easier for people.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

(Public members speaking over each other).

MR. BROWN: Folks, I've run about ten of these meetings. There have been highly divided opinions in most of the communities that we've been at.

I think folks have been polite enough to

let people speak. It saves time. So I'm really going to insist on that.

So start -- the clock is moving. I'll write up my one minute sign. Thank you.

MR. POLLET: We were invited here tonight to comment on, quote, "the potential impacts of proposed actions," unquote.

Unfortunately the Energy Department has failed to inform you of what those proposed actions are that are proposed for Hanford.

You do know, not from the Energy Department unless you go to their federal register notice, that any site chosen for GNEP must, quote, "Require the hosting site to accept and store spent nuclear fuel," unquote.

You're entitled to know, in order to comment intelligently on the scope of impacts that you want to consider, you are entitled to know how much spent nuclear fuel is proposed to be imported.

Indeed, when we say import, you're entitled to know if the proposal includes importing it through the Port of Portland as DOE proposed several years ago.

What are those impacts that should be in the Environmental Impact Statement or the Port of

Tacoma or the Port of Seattle. How many truckloads of nuclear waste will go to through your communities.

How many of these recycling centers -- yes, DOE makes it sound like they're sorting cardboard from paper.

But we know that these are really chemical processing plants. And we're familiar with them at Hanford.

Chemical processing spent nuclear fuel has like created the 53 million gallons of liquid high-level nuclear waste that is sitting in tanks at Hanford.

A million gallons has leaked and is spreading towards the Columbia River faster than the Department of Energy claimed was possible.

MR. BROWN: If you could make one more point. And let me --

MR. POLLET: We're entitled --

MR. BROWN: I'm not taking time off here. If you're not done in two minutes, if you can conclude in two minutes.

And after everybody else has spoken, folks will be able to come back and complete their statement.

So if you can make just one more point.

And I'll move on to the next speaker.

MR. POLLET: We are entitled to know how much spent nuclear fuel. Are you proposing to use old reprocessing facilities like the 325 building, how cracked up would it be, what's the risk to the workers.

Are you proposing brand new major facilities? How many nuclear reactors are you proposing for Hanford?

MR. BROWN: Okay. That's fine.

MR. POLLET: And finally then let me just say, address the fact that you can't clean up while you're adding more.

Please respond to our points in the mail at the end of the scoping process.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Jerry Peltier or Peltier. And it looks like Dan Segna, I'm not sure. Anyway Dan Segna, we'll figure out who that is. Okay. Jerry.

MR. PELTIER: My name is Jerry Peltier. I was an elected official in the Tri-Cities for 24 years. I am a retired Hanford worker.

You know, I applaud the U.S. Department of Energy for its effort to implement the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership GNEP program.

It is the first real initiative that has the potential to provide global energy security, reduce the risk of nuclear proliferation, and improve our environment.

Like all industries, there is a waste stream from nuclear power facilities. These waste streams continue to grow in volume and in size.

Currently we are headed down a path of glassification and permanent burial of our nuclear waste products.

Staying the course in this current practice could have serious consequences on the future generations based on the sheer volume and the radiation levels of the waste.

Now we have the opportunity to reduce the waste product by using fast reactors to consume or destroy transuranics, reducing the need for disposal at Yucca Mountain.

This approach would increase the effective capacity of our geological study, 50 to a hundred times.

As a member of the Hanford Advisory Board, I continually hear terms like "return to the highest beneficial use, risk should drive immediate investigation in technology development, has

technology matured to the point of re-evaluation of cleanup scenarios."

Technology is the long-term answer to reduction of nuclear waste and the GNEP (technology which reprocesses spent fuel) is the first real nuclear reduction technology presented by our government.

MR. BROWN: Okay. About 30 seconds.

MR. PELTIER: Fortunately, the world sees nuclear technology as their path to the energy independence.

We in the Unites States can either become or should I say retain the technical expertise in the field or we can continue to give our technology away to the rest of the world.

If the United States continues to let the rest of the world develop nuclear power stations, we would end up becoming more energy dependent than we are today in the oil market. Remember --

MR. BROWN: Just one more point please.

MR. PELTIER: Okay. I'd rather make one really important point.

MR. BROWN: Well, make it quick.

MR. PELTIER: Okay. I will.

Today we are here on the scoping of the

EIS. I'm going to make some points that I think need to be included in the EIS.

MR. BROWN: Well, again, I've got 50 people signed up to speak. Make one point. And then we've got -- you're welcome to --

MR. PELTIER: No. I'll just give it to you in writing. And you'll have all my points that have been covered by several other speakers anyway.

Let me say by closing that, you know, we cannot afford to let this opportunity slide by. If you want to reduce nuclear waste, you support the vitrification plant, you should support this.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Thanks very much.

Are you Dan?

MR. SEGNA: Don.

MR. BROWN: Don. I'm sorry. Don will be followed by John Wood.

MR. SEGNA: I'm Don Segna, from Richland, Washington. And I've already done this once before. So I've just got one thing I need to get over there.

And looking, trying to assess the situation, there's a lot to people indicating that solar removal conservation should do the trick.

But I haven't seen any numbers. And I

haven't seen any numbers for so long. And I would like that DOE at least give us a handle on all the alternative energies that would have to be put in place if we did not have this concept. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Okay. John Wood. And Gene Kinsey will follow John.

MR. WOOD: Pardon my nerves.

How can you clean up what you can't pronounce?

I'd like to address the terrorist threat from the American nuclear industry. With its current supply of bombs and weapons, our military can kill any person on the globe and can destroy any country or city. But the nuclear industry claims this is not enough.

The nuclear industry wants more bombs to be built, to be built here, because it has an irrational fear and it seeks an irrational solution.

Since there's no safe dose of radiation and there's no known effective disposal method for the nuclear waste, the weapons companies want to build -- I'm sorry, see how I get nervous.

They will start to kill as soon as they are manufactured, even if they are never deployed. Radioactive waste can never be contained as shown by

the current plume of radioactive cancer-causing groundwater and dust leaking from the stare of the art containment at Hanford. If it wasn't state of the art, why isn't it.

In terms of the amount of time that the waste remains radioactive, the spreading of the waste is nearly instantaneous.

In other words, it doesn't make much difference if the poisons are spread by a dirty bomb or by leaky tanks. The land from miles around will soon be rendered lethally toxic to human and animal life.

So the nuclear industry really offers us the same result as the terrorist dirty bomber, lethally contaminated American heartland soil that we can't set foot on without dying or becoming sick.

Make no mistake, the decision to create more plutonium for more bombs at Hanford or anywhere else is an emotional decision, not a rational decision.

A rational decision would not minimize public input by having only this forum for the entire state to register its opinion.

Reason would dictate that we don't create something that will forever sicken and kill us and

harm our habitat if we have no way to neutralize it.

Reason would remind us that we have more than enough bombs already. Reason would remind us that current threats to national security come from low-tech countries.

Reason would remind us that even in a nuclear war, the race to detonate bombs of this type would wipe out the entire human population. Reason would cause us to use diplomacy and economic sanctions to reduce threats.

It is only the irrational, emotional American nuclear industry that would trade away regional safety and national security for a few jobs, a guarantee of local and regional cancer deaths, and a very high risk of one of these bombs actually going off some day with horrific consequences.

And lastly, don't forget that in an effort to come up with the money for the new weapons, we sell the ones that used to be state of the art to other countries that we cannot control.

That is truly irrational, and our government does it with every budget cycle. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Gene Kinsey. And he will be followed by Dona Kirk.

MR. KINSEY: I'm Gene Kinsey. I was born in Goldendale and grew up in Mt. Adams near Trout Lake. I'm a veteran and have served in the military in Korea.

I believe in God. And I thank him and my ancestors for the quality of life that we enjoy here in America.

I'm going to skip some here. I am in favor of the restart of the FFTF start-up that needs to be part of the GNEP program. And that's a very good reactor. And that it's perfectly capable of doing some GNEP research.

For those who are fearful of nuclear issues, let me remind you of this: In 1980, Mt. Saint Helens blew.

And according to the Roadside Geology of Washington, it blew with the force of 21,000 nuclear bombs. The energies that man controls on this planet do not compare with this fury.

I would encourage GNEP to consider one more addition to their things-to-do list. I think a new type of reactor could be developed that would separate water into its gas components of hydrogen and oxygen.

With this new type of reactor, our nation's dependency on fossil fuel for rail transport could be

shifted to hydrogen power.

The oxygen released could be inserted into our rivers to improve the quality of life for salmon and other marine life.

This would be a much better solution than remove every dams or spilling water to lose the power generated benefit.

Using hydrogen produced here in America from water would be a much better choice than purchasing fossil from a foreign source.

I thank you very much for listening to me.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Dona Kirk. And she will be followed by Linda Alexander.

MS. KIRK: Well, I'm kind of blown away by the hysteria that I see here tonight. It's not a surprise, but I think as Americans that we are all obligated to educate ourselves. And DOE has an obligation to educate Americans.

People around the globe have this power. They're using it, perhaps 70 percent of their power is nuclear. They don't have a problem with it.

They're using this technology and they're going to be ahead of us. We will no longer be able to power if we do not pay attention right now. And that's why I believe that the FFTF has to be

considered.

In 2005, the Energy Policy Act was passed. And it required the Federal Government to remain diligent in its cleanup efforts. GNEP has the major role in that plan.

In order to be good stewards of our national resources, it's necessary to continue to develop the technology that will decrease the volume of toxicity of the nuclear waste we are responsible for.

We must use developing recycling technology or face mountains of vitrified waste that have no destination. That's the reality.

I don't see anybody offering solutions. All I hear is hysteria about how terrible this is going to be and let's clean it up. Well, let's clean it up.

The potential for power production, better lifestyle production, and reduced dependence on foreign oil and hydropower cannot be ignored by our county at this point in history. This mission can't wait.

The FFTF reactor at the Hanford Research Facility, existing infrastructure and superior testing staff and experience are the only timely choice for

this research and development if we are to make Hanford the leadership position in the world today and prolong the non-proliferation policies and technologies to flourish.

Together we can clean up power and destroy the materials that cannot be allowed to fall into the hands of would-be terrorists.

Dr. Adam Hall Garnish (phonetic), who is a foremost expert in the area of nuclear physics, just two weeks ago after personal -- I've got to get this one here -- after personal foundation of its condition, looking at the fast flux reactor, he said and I quote -- this man holds a Pulitzer Prize in nuclear physics. And he said that "The FFTF has testing abilities unmatched anywhere in the world."

MR. BROWN: If you can make that your final point. Thank you.

Linda Alexander? I looks like David Ahearns or some such -- you're next, please.

MS. ALEXANDER: Scottish people say "Waste not, want not." There's a law of current observation of energy, energy is neither created nor destroyed, rather converted into different forms.

Remember when initially recycling was considered non-profitable? As we now know, today

recycling otherwise waste products is a multi billion dollar a year industry.

The most environmentally compatible and responsible solution the nuclear industry can do is recycle the partially spent commercial fuel, thereby dramatically expending the radioactivity while using by-products to alleviate disease, leaving low-level waste, and saving taxpayers billions of dollars for costly long-term repositories.

The reason partially spent commercial waste is so highly radioactive is it's full of potential energy, needing to be designed and configured to be effectively converted into much needed large amounts of power, freeing our nation from dependence on foreign sources.

If Former President Dwight Eisenhower could see today's advanced technologies and possibilities -- yet unimaginable at the time of his historic Atoms for Peace speech which was about 50 years ago -- I think he would be delighted to see our ability to reprocess and recycle waste.

And get a heart, heart of America, for the positive contributions our FFTF can produce in medicine: early detection of disease; and specialized treatment of targeted issues, organs, and bodily

systems besieged by illness without harming healthy tissues.

MR. BROWN: Could you make one more point, please.

MS. ALEXANDER: Okay. Would the State of Oregon be happy to send the trojan fuel by-products for recycling?

MR. BROWN: Thank you. David Ahearns. And Sabine Hilding will follow David.

MR. AHEARNS: Okay. I'm just a retired engineer. I have no dog in this fight. I live in West Richland. I retired from FFTF. I was the cognizance engineer on the main heat transport system.

It's a shame that that plant was torn down -- or shut down, it is not torn down yet. And it shouldn't be, because the Japanese and the French both tried to build reactive units like that. Their's looked like a Yugo compared to a Honda. And that's the Honda out there.

That FFTF is one of the finest pieces of equipment that was ever put together. And I don't think you could even replace it, no matter how much money you wanted to spend, because you couldn't get the engineering staff put together to design and build the thing.

But anyhow, this is not a military thing. I'm as liberal as Ron Wyden. But I'm for this. I'm not quite as liberal as Ron Wyden I guess, but close to it.

And I think military intelligence is an oxymoron. And this is not military. It was the military that did it in World War II that got it contaminated, yes.

Because they were running the shortest cycles they could. They were hauling it up, dissolving it in nitric acids, extracting the plutonium chemically, and sticking the rest in tanks.

Well, the military ain't good at taking care of things sometimes. I was in the military, that's why I know it's an oxymoron.

MR. BROWN: Just one more point, please. Thanks.

MR. AHEARNS: Okay. And if you're going to rely on windmills and biofuels for alternate energy, you're going to be left holding an empty sack long after I'm gone from this world.

MR. BROWN: Sabine Hilding. She will be followed by Jeanie Sedgely.

MS. HILDING: My name is Sabine Hilding. And I'm from Hanford Watch. Well, I'm kind

of blown away by the foolish support for this boondoggle. There should be more hysteria.

I'd like to thank Senator Wyden for his input on the entire GNEP and that it's a broad concept.

Number two, the discussion of this meeting implies the premises that the GNEP is a done deal, but Congress has not yet funded this.

Number three, I'd also like to object to the glib terminology borrowed from the environmental movement and from public relations to describe this awful environmentally toxic idea.

Number four, the massive buildings and construction costs of this project means many new jobs and millions of dollars.

The nuclear workers in the Tri-Cities have short-term vested international interests and should have under no say about what we'll be doing long-term about pollution eventually effecting the health of the entire northwest.

Five, as to the GNEP, the dangers of using nuclear power to combat global climate change is simply an insurmountable risk. It's a risk in China, it's a risk here. It's a risk in France.

MR. BROWN: Mike Korenko will be

following Jeanie.

MS. SEDGELY: My name is Jeanie Sedgely. And I'm with Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility.

And I would like to thank the Department of Energy for having this meeting. That's very much appreciated.

Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility joins with the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Federation of American Scientists, and many others in opposing the Department of Energy's Global Nuclear Energy Partnership.

We oppose GNEP in general, and Hanford as a hosting facility in particular. Problems with the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership: to propose new technology to reprocessed spent nuclear fuel does not currently exist and is decades away from feasibility.

GNEP undercuts a 30 year U.S. non-proliferation policy to discourage the spread of national processing plants.

It will spread sensitive nuclear technology and could lead to additional proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The Department of Energy fails to consider the true life-cycle costs of nuclear energy or new

reprocessing, especially the storage and cost of waste cleanup.

As far as Hanford in particular, new production at Hanford would divert focus away from its mission, environmental cleanup.

It would involve importing nuclear waste to Hanford when the site is already struggling to manage its 53 million gallons of high-level nuclear waste in aging tanks.

It would involve storing this nuclear waste for decades. Again, Hanford has enough problems storing what it already has.

MR. BROWN: One more comment please.

MS. SEDGELY: Until the Department of Energy demonstrates that it can successfully complete its current mission of environmental clean up, it should not even consider adding new ways to its most contaminated site. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Mike. Mike will be followed by Phil Ohl.

MR. KORENKO: I was the manager at Westinghouse Hanford that led the development of what we call the energy park concept. The Fast Flux Test Facility, FMEF, and the development department reported to me.

I am pro-nuclear. But I still do not support the blank check for bringing in all the fuel into Hanford. I have an alternative that I'm going to talk about in a second, that's the sum of GNEP.

I first wanted to let you know about some experiments we did at Hanford that I think you deserve as the public to know about, because not they're not widely known. In fact, I don't even think DOE knows about the experiments that they paid for.

First, while we developed advanced processing techniques that a long -- be able to separate long-lived radioisotopes.

You hear about actinides separation. We actually developed it already. This is 15 years ago from taking off the radionuclides.

We can take the Hanford double shell tanks and hold it in our hands, we did that. That technology exist. It just needs to be upgraded.

Number two, we view these isotopes not as a waste, but as an asset. We took atoms of technetium 99, we armed them with monoclonal antibodies and we put them into a cancer cure.

The monoclonal antibodies look for the high-growth cancer. And the technetium zaps it. That's in clinical trials. That was at Hanford,

that's from the waste.

MR. BROWN: You wanted a verbal notice for a minute. Here it is.

MR. KORENKO: Holy cow. That was fast. Okay. We produce the gadolinium-153 for treating osteoporosis.

Most importantly, you think reactors can take lebangaol (phonetic). We took technetium 99 in FFTF and converted it to a nonradioactive lethenium (phonetic).

It's possible to use a reactor to take radioactive material and produce it nonradioactive. That's not why we know. We should know that. And FFTF did that.

I propose a two-phase process. To just limit the first phase of GNEP to the energy northwest fuel that already exists at Hanford, process that, start up FFTF. Don't go any further into the Hanford waste that's cleaned up.

And phase two, open up only regionally to northwest reprocessing. And there should be five regional processing centers in the country. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Phil will be followed by Rick Freeman.

MR. OHL: Thank you. My name is Phil Ohl. I'll state up front that I am for siting the Advanced Reactor and Reprocessing Facility at Hanford.

I'd like to encourage the Department of Energy to include a discussion on energy supply and demand alternative methods for supplying energy for the demand the United States is going to have.

Having said that, I'll say that I believe that nuclear energy is clean energy. It doesn't have greenhouse effects.

I believe that recycling and reprocessing relieves current monitored retrievable storage burden on the current fleet of nuclear reactors in the country.

I believe that reprocessing and recycling will dramatically increase the volume available to go to Yucca Mountain by reducing the activity and the waste form, final waste form that goes to Yucca Mountain.

I believe that controlled reprocessing to provide fuel for emerging nuclear countries will dramatically reduce global proliferation, since those countries will not have to recycle or re -- recycle their own fuel, reprocess their own fuel, be able to get fuel from the IAEA.

I believe that in southeastern Washington there exists a trained and competent work force at a safe location to produce nuclear energy.

I believe that this will help the community of the Tri-Cities to solve the work force transition. As Hanford continues to go away, jobs continue to go away, and waste continues to go away despite some of the hysteria we've heard about tonight.

And finally I believe that the FFTF and the FMEF are economically attractive locations for siting of GNEP. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay. Rick Freeman. And Natalie Troyer will be next.

MR. FREEMAN: My name is Rick Freeman. And I have no affiliations. But I am in support of GNEP. That's all I've got.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Is Natalie here? Did you have time to get ready? That was a quick presentation. Paige Knight will be following.

MS. TROYER: Hello. My name is Natalie Troyer. I am the publications and volunteer coordinator for Heart of America Northwest in Seattle.

I'm grateful that the Department of Energy has agreed to host this meeting in Hood River. And I'm please with tonight's turnout.

But I come to you tonight expressing a simple message. It's one that nearly 70 percent of Washington voters have expressed in 2004 with Initiative 297. We can't add more waste at Hanford without cleaning up what's already there.

And obviously the cleanup process isn't coming along as flawlessly, timely, and efficiently as initially expected. The current plan at Hanford is decades behind schedule and $8 billion over budget.

It's also only designed to treat half of the existing tank waste. And now there's a proposal to bring in much of the nation's spent nuclear fuel to Hanford for recycling.

Don't be deceived by this word though. It's simply a synonym for reprocessing, which is exactly what created the 53 million gallons of waste already at Hanford, currently sitting in leaky storage tanks.

Over 1 million gallons of waste has already leaked from Hanford's high-level nuclear waste tanks. And contamination is rapidly spreading toward the Columbia River.

The reality is this: If Hanford is chosen as a site to reprocess spent fuel, thousands of truckloads of high-level nuclear waste would go

through Portland on I-5, 205, and 84, and back to Hanford.

If the purpose of this meeting is for the public to comment on what environmental and health impacts need to be studied and disclosed from this proposal, then transportation needs to be an issue of pertinence.

The idea of Hanford be chosen as a site to reprocess spent nuclear fuel is not a welcomed one.

Before we further totally become the most contaminated site in the western hemisphere, we should look at the risks to our communities, our future generations, and our pocketbooks.

Listen to the voters: Clean up the mess before adding more to the problem. Thank you for your time.

MR. BROWN: Douglas Charters will follow Paige.

MS. KNIGHT: I would like to thank the Department of Energy for accepting the proposal from the State of Oregon and some of us groups, to have this hearing here. So thank you.

We are all concerned for the energy future of the planet. There's no question about that, as far as I see this room.

And to offer some of our considerations on the legacy we will leave our children. Since most of us, according to the NEI or Nuclear Energy Institute, will be dead by the time these processes can be built and put in place. So I'm thinking about my children's grandchildren here and all of the future generations.

According to the Nuclear Energy Institute, a paper marked March 2006, "Nuclear Waste Disposal for the Future, the Potential of Reprocessing and Recycling," there is no advantage to reprocessing at this time. There is no near-term benefit.

The process results in four fission products, which will greatly impact the waste storage. Strontium-90 and CCM 137 generate large amounts of heat for 50 to 80 years, which increases the storage space needed either in Yucca or on storage pads.

It also creates the need for very expensive infrastructure. Iodine 129 and technetium 99 would be major contributors to radiation dose in the biosphere.

U.S. policymakers have already concluded in the past that reprocessing would result in the buildup of stockpiles as separated pure plutonium, which is a terrorist threat.

The infrastructure required for this program is huge. We're talking not a few buildings,

but eight buildings so far in some of the literature I've read.

Uranium re-enrichment facility. Fuel fabrication facility for MOX fuel. Modified reactors to burn the MOX.

Storage or aging paths for the radioactive decay of CCM and strontium. Transmutation facilities for iodine 129 and technetium 99.

Fabrication facilities for the actinide base fuel to burn the remaining plutonium, americium, and neptunium. And advanced fast spectrum reactors to burn the MOX.

Again, the report concludes the technology is not available to accomplish what is envisioned.

MR. BROWN: Please make just one more point.

MS. KNIGHT: Okay. Hanford cleanup is the first priority. DOE has proven over the years that it cannot walk and chew gum at the same time.

A clean entity is a misnomer in this project, in that according to the latest GAO report on the NRC, which is the Nuclear Regulatory Commission which is supposed to oversee the safety of our plants, over tens of thousands of safety breaches have occurred in plants across the country and NRC does not

have a handle on this. So I think this is a really poor proposal at this time.

MR. BROWN: Doug Charters. And Clint Diditer is to follow.

MR. CHARTERS: My name is Doug Charters. I've lived here in the gorge for 47 years. I've seen a lot of the sights that have gone on.

But one thing we keep not having a solution here, we kind of have that -- an ex-wise mentality about this, oh, rather than it would be great to store, we have to maintain and maintain these costs and continual costs.

And probably our best way to deal with the waste problem is to move it off of the plant itself. And that's a dangerous thing to do too.

But if you're thinking of what Hanford -- the guy that one won the X prize there, used tires for his fuel, very cheap rockets.

If we could continue this stuff safely enough to launch it and use solar disposal rather than storage, it would probably be a better day.

I can see some of the good in the globalization of the waste product in keeping control of inventory and things like that, instead of it escaping into the wrong hands.

But maybe we need to think globally that way, then removal from the plant for rather than storage would be maybe a finer thing to do with the end product that we have now. We will continue to deal with this for years and years and years at a great expense.

And this is maybe a whole new industry to start. You know, other than NASA, we've got, what, six or eight countries that have launch facilities already.

We probably need to make some study to find the safest route out of the planet's orbit and into the solar disposal system.

And whether the storage -- I think disposal on a permanent basis would be a wiser thing for us to participate in. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Dave Howard will follow Clint.

MR. DIDITER: Good evening. Thank you, DOE, for being here tonight.

I was born and raised in Franklin County. Ten miles northeast from Hanford. Born there, raised there. I went to school at CBC. I attended Portland State University with Neil Womack (phonetic), Miles Davis.

I played for the Redskins for seven years. I traveled by Three Mile Island every year there to scrimmage the Jets.

I played for the Greenbay Packers. I came back home. And I'm farming ten miles from Hanford. And I'm cancer free.

And I'll tell you what, I don't see a problem with the restart of FFTF. We need to reduce the waste. We need a reactor to reduce the waste.

I've swim to the river, I've eaten the fish out of the river. There's a herd of elk out there that you cannot believe. The wildlife are flourishing around Hanford. I don't believe there's a danger there.

Hanford does not cause cancer. But we have Hanford that can be the answer for cancer through medical isotopes.

My mom and I put on a golf tournament every year for six years for kids with cancer. And when you see kids with cancer, and they're all over the world --

Dan Riley, our strength coach, his kid had cancer. Medical isotopes are the way to fight cancer. Less evasive to the body.

Okay. Your body stays healthy, you attack

the cancer with the medical isotopes. It's also a possible cure for AIDS. New research coming out, fight AIDS with medical isotopes. Thyroid disease, et cetera, et cetera.

The reduction of nuclear waste, in order to reduce the nuclear waste, you need FFTF to restart. The increase in power production will aid in our double of -- that we're going to need in 25 years.

It will also make us energy independence for the U.S. Most importantly the production of medical isotopes, kindlier, gentler cures for cancer, anybody with cancer. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Dave Howard. Dave will be followed by Walter Loehrke.

MR. HOWARD: Good evening. I'm Dave Howard from Vancouver, Washington.

This is an interesting meeting tonight. I remember the first nuclear meeting I attended where discussions were going forward, it was 1975.

I've gone through three and a half decades of hearing the wonderful ideas and trying to understand the wonderful ideas the nuclear industry has to take care of the back side of the fuel cycle. It hasn't been done yet.

And now I'm being told that somewhere

around -- which century are we in, oh, yeah -- 2120 or so, we'll see a facility in place.

So I think the Department of Energy owes it to us all to start to look at these things a little more realistically than enhanced or activated or whatever that term is, improved.

It's sort of like Tide. You know, Tide, when I was growing up, every six months it was new and improved.

I'm pretty certain it's the same old Tide. This is the same old story. We need some information here.

So in the scoping process, one of the things that I would like to see happen is we talk about the overall energy need that this country has, how it will be provided.

Is it true that nuclear power needs to provide more energy? I don't think so. Not given the back side of the fuel cycle, the costs of the back side of the fuel cycle.

I'm quite interested to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and see the cost discussion that goes forward there.

I remember in 1975, I was told that WPPSS would cost this community about $5 billion. And that

was considered cheap.

When they finally shut WPPSS down, the largest default on bonds at that time, the estimates were $27 billion.

Let's look at the cost of this stuff and understand what we're doing. And then we don't have to be quite so emotional about all of this.

And maybe we can have our community interested to solve our energy problems, that's what I want to see. That's why I've worked this for 40 years. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Walt Loehrke is next and Brent Foster is to follow.

MR. LOEHRKE: Hi. I'm Walt Loehrke. For those of you who know me, I'm also County Commissioner for the Columbia River scenic area.

And, you know, I'm thanking DOE for coming. As a board commissioner, I'm going "Why weren't we told about this?" I found out about this on the Channel 6 news.

And I'm going "The tremendous impacts that could happen to this part of the gorge, you would think that the commission would have an interest." I know it. But at any rate, such is communication. And such is trust with the DOE.

I'm also a victim of the WPPSS process. And I can't say that asking now to invest in the technology that may or may not be working is really the smartest thing.

I was told back in the '70's, that the Columbia River would be dry and that my lights would be -- only be able to have light part time.

And we haven't increased any kind of generation here in the northwest. And so what is going on and who is making these predictions?

Fortunately I have plenty of opportunity to respond to these guys in written form. And I too am interested of finding out what their EISs is going to show. And thanks for allowing me to speak tonight.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Brent Foster and Robin Klein will be next.

MR. FOSTER: Good evening. My name is Brent Foster. I'm the executive director for Columbia Riverkeeper.

And I appreciate the opportunity for the hearing tonight, but I also appreciate the fact that so many of you took time to come out and comment, even those I don't necessarily agree with.

We, Columbia Riverkeeper, strongly oppose the proposed project because it would reverse some of

the progress that has been made at Hanford.

And believe it or not, perhaps many of you have come to these meetings for many years, that there has been progress made. And that's important to remember, that it hasn't been for naught.

But at the same time to have made some progress, we take one step forward and then do something like GNEP, which would take us five or six steps back. It seems the very definition of insanity.

To call them nuclear energy clean because it doesn't emit greenhouse gases, is kind of like calling coal clean because it doesn't result in nuclear waste.

To call this as a recycling effort, I think must have sounded really great in a meeting sometime. I'm sure that people were very proud that they would call this reprocessing, which has been a longstanding way to make more nuclear waste.

Recycling, I'm sure that was well rewarded. But the problem is, if this is recycling, it's like putting a bin of cans out in your front lawn to have them recycled and then come out in the morning to find that they have multiplied all over your lawn.

It violates, again, kind of basic principles of common sense. You don't reduce waste by

making more of it.

At Hanford right now, I don't think it's hysteria to be concerned about what's going on. When you have 80 percent of the female Chinook salmon, 80 percent of the salmon that appear to be female are genetically male. This is shocking stuff.

It's not about when radioactive waste will make it to the river. Uranium, strontium, chromium, these things are making its way to the river. Hardly the kind of thing that we want to add to the problems.

And in terms of alternative energy, I think California -- which is kind of weird to point to California as something that we ought to be thinking about, but California, when it says where is it going to get its energy from, said that through increased efficiency, through conservation, and renewables development they can meet their entire need for new energy.

If we want to do that, we can. If we decide to go the old route of nuclear coal and fossil fuel, then there's no question that we won't. I appreciate your time.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Robin Klein and Chuck Johnson will be next.

MS. KLEIN: Hi. My name is Robin

Klein.

Well, the US-DOE is not capable of accomplishing what it sets out to do in this proposal. It can neither reduce the stores of accumulated spent fuel, economically nor safely.

The effort is of monstrous proportions. And the costly impacts are in every arena: they're economic, weapons proliferation, environment, and political.

The consequences economically of reprocessing the spent fuel, when shipping, interim storage, advanced burner reactor refurbishment-construction and reconstruction, associated nuclear waste management facilities construction and maintenance, and the eventual reactor to facilities decommissioning are taken into account, run into the tens of billions of dollars -- and that is by conservative estimates according to expert analysts, many times more than the cost of permanent or semi-permanent dry cask storage.

The consequences in nuclear weapons proliferation would be to significantly increase nuclear weapons-usable inventories, as well as their accessibility here and abroad.

Even the administration recognizes this as

a serious consequence of this reprocessing.

Implementing GNEP would also reverse the longstanding U.S. policy, opposing such reprocessing because of the dangerous of global that this would set as a global precedence with this U.S. leadership.

The consequences environmentally, regionally, have been touched on quite a bit here.

To the region, it's already borne and unreasonably high toxic load of long-lived radiation, siting Hanford for processing tons of new high-level waste imported under GNEP could only mean the administration regards Hanford and the Columbia River as a national sacrifice zone.

However, economic, proliferation-risks, and the disturbing environmental consequences here of the GNEP, what you, the Department of Energy as a federal U.S. agency in a democratic nation, must absorb though above all from the public process are the political consequences.

So there is no confusion, make no mistake. The vast majority of the population in the northwest overwhelmingly opposes importing spent fuel to Hanford and creating new wastes from processing at Hanford.

If anyone were paying attention to the initiatives undertaken in recent years by the states

of Oregon and Washington, and their largest cities Portland and Seattle, you already know how the greater public feels. You already know the answer that you seek here.

MR. BROWN: Can you make just one more comment.

MS. KLEIN: Yeah. GNEP makes no sense on a global, national, or local scale. You have your comments already, preceding the RFP, from millions of folks across the Northwest: "No new wastes go to Hanford.

"No new waste streams from processing should be created at Hanford. And take care of the mess you are already charged with." Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Chuck Johnson? He's not here. Mary Jane Loehrke, you're next.

MS. LOEHRKE: Are we allowed to reapply, to have time to (inaudible)?

MR. BROWN: Well, have you signed up to speak yet?

MS. LOEHRKE: I did.

MR. BROWN: No, I know. But I need to call the next name. I'm just asking if you --

MR. LOEHRKE: Oh. I'll pass.

MR. BROWN: Okay. If you want to

speak, we can get your name on the list next. Jerry Hess?

MR. JOHNSON: Actually, I'm here. Chuck Johnson.

MR. BROWN: All right. You're next. If you can step up to the microphone over there.

MR. JOHNSON: Over there?

MR. BROWN: Right. And Jerry Hess will follow.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. I'm Chuck Johnson. I'm on the board of Columbia Riverkeeper. And I appreciate the opportunity to speak at this hearing.

It's very reminiscent of a lot of hearings we've had over the years on Hanford. A little bit too reminiscent I'd have to say.

Unfortunately it seems to me that we seem stuck on this concept of whether Hanford is truly a site that needs cleaning up or whether it's a site where we're going to continue to experiment with nuclear materials and with reprocessing, which is technology that has not been proven to work anywhere in the world, including such countries as France, which we hold up as being this beacon of nuclear acumen.

80 percent of their electricity comes from nuclear. And yet they haven't been able to make reprocessing work for their reactors either.

So my thought is that it really would be great us for in the northwest to unite together. Bring a lot of good jobs to the Hanford area by promoting the clean up of the waste on site.

Not add to the problem, but to focus on the problem we already have at hand. And just realize that a lot of mistakes are made at Hanford and a lot of money and time is going to be required to fix those mistakes. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Jerry Hess is next. And Robert Hedlund will follow.

MR. HESS: I'm Jerry Hess. I'm also with Columbia Riverkeeper, but just a member. I guess my main comment is people are going to say in years to come, "What was this administration thinking? You know, what is going on here?"

We've been treated to lies, lies, lies. And I'm not saying the Department of Energy is lying to us at this time, but they are part of the government, part of this administration. This is, to me, very important.

I just went to a meeting in Pendleton last

month on delisting of wolves. And the Department of Fish & Wildlife is pushing this as a fast process, to get this done.

And why do I feel that they're doing this? Because they want to get this finished before the present administration is done. Okay.

And so what has been going on? The clean up at Hanford has taken -- and now they're having their 20th anniversary.

I went to a meeting, just for a quick example, April 7th, 2005, here in Hood River. One of the notes that I put down was "Money used to secure plutonium goes out of the cleanup budget." Does that make any sense?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MR. HESS: Okay. But, and then the other notes that I have, the '05 was 2 billion. '06, $1.8 billion.

The budget is going down for this cleanup. It isn't getting any better. We need to clean this up before we start anything new.

We are not needing nuclear energy. Why don't we get the cars, why doesn't our president work on the automobile industry and raise the mileage standards from 25 -- you know, 50 to a hundred? You

know, instead of being all excited about going from 16 to 18 miles. Jeez.

I've got one more quick comment. And I'd like to paraphrase Senator Ron Wyden, if it's okay. I've just got one sentence.

"When you start separating nuclear waste, everything it touches becomes radioactive, including the buildings you build to do the reprocessing."

I think this is something that you need to think about it. Thanks.

MR. BROWN: Robert Hedlund. Then Nancy White will be next.

MR. HEDLUND: First of all I'd like to thank DOE for having this meeting or to the people that forced them to have this meeting.

But you know, there's been good and bad things said on both sides. I agree that when the FFTF reactor was built, it was probably built by the older generation which knew what the hell they were doing at the time.

These new scientists can't figure out how to clean up anything. I mean, I've worked at the Trojan Nuclear Plant. I helped build it and I helped shut it down.

And the idea that radiation is an

infection. You ask the 28 families around Hanford, their kids with no eyes, no brains, you know, ask them.

You know, I ran the deadly deception on television this last month. This guy that lived ten miles from there.

You know, out of 200 calves one year, they had to destroy 80 of them because they had extra legs and stuff.

You know, hey, I dug through their Superfund sites on Front Avenue. Two of my kids are dead.

Everybody in the family has had cancer and stuff from pollution and radiation, you know. It's a joke.

You know, and Sterling McKee (phonetic), ten years ago told me when the British out there, we're going to give them $6 billion to build the vitrification plant, he told me that they hadn't gotten the bugs out of it yet and we already started it.

Backbone, and Sage, Truam Hill (phonetic), and the rest of them's got it. And they don't -- you know, they built part of it, get a bonus, then tear it down. They didn't do it right. Let's clean up our

mess.

There's more radiation going down the Columbia River than any other river in the world. We've got -- Oregon's -- you know, we got bamboozled when we built Trojan down there.

Hell, all the power went to California. Enron, they were laughing all the way to the bank.

You know, if you want to build something, build it out in the Cayman Islands where these folks are hiding their money. Anyway --

MR. BROWN: If you could make one more point.

MR. HEDLUND: All right. We've got cannisters down there at Trojan sitting against the bank.

You know, they're not being -- we need a little bit of a security. But our security is by cleaning this stuff up.

You know, turn the lights off an hour ahead of time and we would save enough money to do it.

MR. BROWN: Nancy White? Is it Jurgen Hess? Thank you.

MR. HESS: Thank you. Jurgen Hess.

It's my birthday today. I was born in 1941 in Hamburg, Germany. My birthplace was obliterated in

1943 by Allied carpet bombing. 400,000 people died.

As a child of war, it's been my lifelong hope that humans would learn from our past mistakes - grow smarter like other species. But the Iraq war proved me wrong.

Now, with the insane Iraq war, we're proposing to continue and make -- now, like the insane Iraq war, we're proposing to continue and make worse the nuclear mistakes of the past - more desecration at Hanford.

Insanity is defined as persistent mental disorder - something extremely foolish. That clearly fits the state of Hanford and this proposal.

My mother told me to clean up my mess before I do could anything else; no matter how logical that anything else seemed to me.

GNEP perpetuates a myth that we can tame the nuclear monster. Scientists say "Trust us." Yet as long as we humans are involved, accidents will happen. And just like the death of the salmon from dams, unforeseen consequences happen.

In her book Reason for Hope, Jane Goodall explains that there is a lag between human's new technological inventions and our ethical and moral judgment as to how to use that technology.

That was true of DDT where we eventually came to our senses to close that gap. With nuclear energy we are still evolving, it's like a hammer given to a child who looks for walls to pounds on. Hanford, the earth and civilization's walls.

Understandably, some Richland folks favor GNEP. To Richland folks I say "It's time to change." Industries and economies change. It's happening in The Dalles as their aluminum industry died.

It happened to the logging industry that no longer is cutting "old growth." It's happening in Detroit.

In closing, my mother was right, "Clean up your mess first, especially before you go out and play." Don't play with our lives and the greatest creation ever - the earth.

Clean up Hanford completely before even thinking about bringing any more nuclear waste.

On my birthday, I'm giving you a present - my hope. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Brad Hippert. David Adams. Brad's here, okay. Thanks.

MR. HIBBERT: Key elements of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership talk about their strategy, develop incorporation nuclear safeguards,

develop advanced technologies, develop advanced reactors.

1984, my roommate in college at that time had his Ph.D. in nuclear physics. We took a tour of the Tokamak Nuclear Reactor in Princeton, New Jersey.

Spent an inordinate amount of money trying to create nuclear fusion. We're talking nuclear fission here. We're talking about a whole new process.

That process at Princeton, at that Tokamak, they had 32-plus Ph.D.s around the clock, 360 -- seven days a week, 365, every ten to fifteen minutes, so it was a hundred thousand dollars in 1984 dollars.

They're still not any closer to nuclear fusion. We're talking about a whole new process. Incredibly complicated.

It's going to take vast, vast resources to make this work, if it can work. If we're going to put money into anything, let's put it into fusion not into fission. Not into these processes.

We had the solution right here in Portland -- excuse me, right here in Oregon. It's called renewables.

Iceland, the most economically strong nation in the country has the highest per capita

standard in the world. Why? Renewables. We have what it takes here to do that. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: David Adams, and then Daryl Francis.

MR. ADAMS: Hi everybody. I'm Dave Adams. A non-affiliated person from Hood River.

You know, after my wife's treatment for a recurrence of her lymphoma, we relocated here in Hood River.

And we came to the gorge, drawn by the appearance of a relatively unspoiled, a place to live and work and recreate. And as you might guess, we're real sensitive to issues relating to cancer-causing materials.

I've heard of Hanford, but only as bit of a historical trivia, kind of a footnote to the Manhattan Project.

And I was surprised to learn a couple of things. That first, there's a fair amount of pollution there. And I had no idea that it was there, much less the extent of it.

And secondly, the proximity of that nuclear waste to the Columbia River that flows right by my house, well, yeah, a mile away --

(Audience asking Mr. Adams to repeat his statement).

MR. ADAMS: It flows a mile away from the house.

And, well, I can speak without this, (indicating, difficulties with the microphone).

As you might guess, anyway, I'm aware that there's a huge and increasing need for energy. And that nuclear continues to be talked about as a part of that.

I don't think anything the DOE does about siting this plan is going to change that, you know.

But as for the proposal, to site and reopen Hanford, I want to say simply: No. Not here. Not now, not ever.

The only appropriate business is the one that you've heard about so many times from so many people. There's a mess there. Learn how to clean it up right and then clean it up.

The Columbia River Basin doesn't need a single gram more nuclear material in it. We've got plenty. Thank you.

If there's any folks worried about this country's continued leadership, let's look at leading in something that's worthwhile.

Let's lead it and move away from nuclear proliferation, leading away from waste producing

materials.

Let's look into leading into technologies that are truly clean and into a nuke-free future. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Daryl Francis. Let's see if this is working (indicating). We may need to take a quick break. Let me hand this over to you, (giving Mr. Francis a new microphone).

MR. FRANCIS: I'm Bill Francis. I work for an environmental and safety operation in Richland, Washington.

And on December 9th, 2006, the joint session of the annual meeting of the members of Environmental for Nuclear Energy, the EFN-USA, and the board of EFN-International adopted a resolution in support of a GNEP facility at the Hanford site and the continuation of the FFTF as an important component of that program.

Because of Hanford's many years of experience in nuclear energy research and the operation of the FFTF, the Hanford site is perfectly suited for the development and continuation of research in the GNEP program with the FFTF as one of the major facilities.

EFN considers the location of the major

GNEP research center at Hanford as a sound choice and the underlines of the FFTF as an essential facility for this research.

It will contribute to the development of clean and safe nuclear fuel cycles and the development of the Generation IV reactors, to make sure that the future generations have a continuing supply and abundance and affordable power - long after oil and gas is depleted - so as to ensure the continuation of our civilization for millennia, safely and without harm to the environment.

This resolution is signed by Bruno Comby, the president of the EFN-International; and Berol Robinson, president of the EFN-USA.

EFN is a non-profit international organization, gathering more than 8,000 members and supporters.

It has a network of similar organizations and local correspondents in more than 50 countries, to inform the public on energy and the environment. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Our next speaker is Kris Gann. And Kris will be followed by Angela Crowley-Koch.

MS. GANN: Good evening. I'm Kris

Gann. And I live in Hood River. And I'm also a board member of Columbia Riverkeeper. And I also thank you for having this meeting.

I have three comments to make, and I'll be brief. Number one, there is already a huge cleanup problem at Hanford which must be completed as originally agreed to, to protect our Columbia River.

Second, it makes no sense to create -- it makes no sense to create and add more waste to this site that is already polluted.

And finally, it also makes no sense to transport radioactive nuclear waste across the country, through our towns and cities, and along our river. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Angela will be followed by Louisa Hamachek.

MS. CROWLEY-KOCH: I'm Angela Crowley-Koch, the executive director of Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility.

Thank you, DOE, for having this meeting tonight.

The DOE is asking us to trust them with the GNEP program. They're asking us to trust them that they can reduce the amount of nuclear waste and that they can limit access to weapons-grade nuclear

material.

I don't trust DOE on these two issues. First of all, in order to reduce nuclear waste, you need something called a fast reactor.

There are only three fast reactors operating in the world. And the reason is because they are dangerous and costly.

And many of -- only 20 have been built in the world. One of them at Morris, Illinois. That was never opened. They're so dangerous.

And the one in France will be closed in two years. France has not been able to reduce the amount of nuclear waste that they have.

And why should we trust the DOE that we will be able to reduce the amount of nuclear waste that we have.

Second of all, the DOE is asking us to trust them, so that they will be able to make the reprocess plutonium proliferation resistant.

How can we trust the DOE when this technology does not exist today. And if it could exist, why hasn't France thought of it, since they have been reprocessing for 30 years.

How can we expect that we can come up with this brand new technology and to be able to keep this

weapons-grade plutonium out of the hands of dangerous people.

In France -- we've heard a lot of talk about France tonight. There was a study in France that concluded that reprocessing is uneconomical.

It has cost France $25 billion-more than a once-through fuel cycle. So let's not talk about France.

It's not working in France. And France doesn't have the technology that the GNEP program proposes.

Finally, we need to think about the global ramifications of the GNEP program. This isn't just about creating more jobs in the Tri-Cities area, it's not just about more pollution at Hanford, this is opening Pandora's nuclear box.

If we begin reprocessing after 30 years of not reprocessing in the United States, other countries will want to reprocess.

And in fact, several countries have already stated that they want to: South Africa, Brazil, South Korea.

If reprocessing is so safe, are we going to let Iran start reprocessing? I'm not sure that we will.

MR. BROWN: If you could make one final comment.

MS. CROWLEY-KOCH: Thank you. Finally, in the back of the room there is a ballot, where you can vote on nuclear weapons and nuclear waste.

So if you'll please remember to vote before you leave. Thank you. Those green sheets, I'll be submitting those as public comment. Thank you so much.

MR. BROWN: Louisa Hamachek. And next is Peter Chabarek with Veterans for Peace.

MS. HAMACHEK: Thank you. I'm Louisa Hamachek from Eugenians for a Safe Columbia River. And I thank DOE for putting on this second northwest hearing, so that more people could have a chance to talk.

I was at the Pasco hearing two weeks ago. And it was mainly -- most of the speakers were hoping to -- they were from the Pasco, Hanford area, and they were hoping to have the jobs there.

My main thing that I would like to say is do not open up the Hanford facility to more processing, because though the Hanford area people get the jobs, we don't get the money anywhere's downriver.

And the radioactive materials can go

downriver and into the fish and they're taken up in the irrigation water.

And that food goes out to the whole country. And we don't have any idea where that's going and whether I'm eating it or feeding it to my children. And from there, it goes on out to the sea. And there, it's part of an international fishery.

That it's not fair that you and the Hanford area get the jobs and the money and we get the pollution and the poison and the cancer and the genetic deformations.

And in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act in 1992 concerning Yucca Mountain, there was -- the level of 15 millirems per year is an exposure limit that the DOE decided was allowable for people living near the Yucca Mountain site.

And I was wondering if the DOE could respond to how many millirems per year a person who eats the fish from the Columbia River that spawned in the Hanford Reach in the area, all around Hanford, that's leaking out nuclear waste at this time, nuclear fluids, how much exposure those people are expected to get if they eat salmon from there once a week, twice a week.

I know that there are people who would like

to eat it that way and they have the right to eat the fish from there.

But if they have more of an exposure than that, they will -- the DOE is in infraction of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act 1992.

And I invite the operators of Hanford, of the DuPont, the GE operators, Bechtel, to eat the salmon four times a week from Hanford Reach. And bon appétit.

MR. BROWN: Peter Chabarek will be followed by Rachael Pecore.

MR. CHABAREK: Good evening. My name is Peter Chabarek. Veterans for Peace, Chapter 929, Eugene, Oregon.

A little personal history. My grandparents fled the Middle East during World War I, because of a religious amount of fundamentalists.

My father spent four years in the trenches of Europe in World War II in the Army. My brother was almost killed in the World Trade Center on September 11th. I say this because there's an issue here that's not being addressed.

The GNEP will require transporting thousands of shipments of high-level nuclear waste on Oregon highways and rail lines, meaning thousands of

opportunities for terrorist attack.

Imagine a tractor trailer loaded with waste blown up on I-5 in Portland. One study indicated this would cause 1,300 immediate deaths and make 300 square miles of Portland, the Portland metro area uninhabitable. Nuclear materials are a major magnet for terrorists.

Another point. A permanent solution to the waste problem was supposed to have been found decades ago. Yucca Mountain is not scheduled to open until 2019.

The technology for dealing with the waste still is not close to reality. And you want us to trust the government.

I was part of the Successful Citizens Initiative in 1980, in which a ballot measure was passed by the Oregon voters to prohibit construction in one of the nuclear plants in the state of Oregon until a permanent solution for the waste was found. We're still waiting for that, for that solution.

And I'll tell you, if the DOE were to play with this, the people of Oregon will rise up again. We will prevent the transportation of these wastes on our highways and railroads.

The GNEP statement on the DOE website says

this is to prepare for a vast expansion of commercial nuclear plants.

The great majority of the Americans do not want more nuclear plants, it is not "emission-free" energy as the DOE claimed. It emits deadly radiation for thousands of years. And you want us to trust the government.

MR. BROWN: If you can make your final point.

MR. CHABAREK: I will speculate, I will make one final point, I will speculate that the great majority of people who testify in favor of GNEP, are people from the nuclear industry, commercial interests, and former Hanford employees who stand to make a lot of money if Hanford reopens.

The vast majority of the people opposed are volunteer grass-roots activists who will not make a penny from keeping Hanford shut down. Who are you going to trust?

MR. BROWN: Rachael will be followed by Sam Dunlap.

MS. PECORE: Can you hear me? Hi. My name is Rachael Pecore. I'm a water quality scientist for Columbia Riverkeeper.

The administration is considering more

nuclear power because it's how incredibility serious the threat of global warming and carbon emissions really are.

That said, I'm frightened that a process that has the highest routine air emissions as well as radioactive acidic-less liquid waste has been proposed.

When a study already completed by the American Wind Energy Association has deemed that, and I quote, "The great plains of Saudi Arabia of wind energy provides enough potential power to meet more than one-third present U.S. electrical consumption needs." Please note that in reasonable alternatives to be analyzed in the PEIS.

If they have the technology to render nuclear waste safe and clean it up and it's true, then why has the Hanford plume reached the Columbia River. The way to stop cancer is to stop releasing carcinogens.

I'd like to remind the administration of 1972 when President Ford formally stopped reprocessing after India imported U.S. reprocessing technology and used it to build a nuclear weapon in 1974.

I'd also like to add that reprocessing is not recycling. A repository is limited by heat and

reprocessed waste is much hotter than spent fuel.

In closing, I ask DOE to delete the $250 million funding request for the GNEP and transfer those funds to clean up.

250 million could help that promised vitrification plant that has been postponed for lack of funds. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Mark Robinowitz will follow Mr. Dunlap.

MR. DUNLAP: Good evening. Thank you for holding this hearing and giving us an opportunity to vent.

My name is Sam Dunlap. I'm a mixed-blood man and I'm associated with the Hawaiian people from Celilo Village.

I have a short statement and a question. It's a bittersweet experience to bring comments to this panel; well-intentioned, polite, white bureaucrats who have no intention of staying in place long enough, in fact probably retiring before anything -- a change can take place.

My elder brother, Chief Howard Jim, of the Hawaiian people sits in his little square BIA house beside the now-silent Columbia Celilo Falls and he send me with a question. When will he be allowed to

return to his beloved White Cliffs to pray?

That's not my statement tonight. And that's not my question tonight. That's what I said to you in October of 1999.

Since then Chief Howard Jim died, I believe of a broken heart over the broken promises that he endured in his lifetime.

So what have you done with the eight years that we gave you on that occasion? The cleanup activities at Hanford has been pathetic and disgustingly obfuscating.

53 million gallons of the radioactive waste languish in their rotting, rusting tanks. The radioactive plume still approaches Columbia groundwaters, leading directly to the waters of this beautiful river.

Deformed fish and amphibians are commonplace on this river. Downwinders and aquatic resource-dependent natives suffer from increasing rates of cancer and associated diseases.

GNEP presents the same thread-bare proposals that were floated to us in 1999. GNEP is like putting lipstick on a pig. Please stop it.

MR. BROWN: And Jack Dresser will follow Mark.

MR. ROBINOWITZ: 120 seconds is not enough time for democracy. But I formally demand that the scoping process hold public hearings in Seattle, Portland, and all other communities that would host transportation facilities used for this nuclear waste transport: ports, highways, and trains.

The EIS needs to be expanded to include the cumulative impact of this mobile Chernobyl and the amount of energy input it would require in the fuel cycle.

Nuclear reprocessing, the correct term, involves dropping ultrahazardous irradiated fuel rods that are lethal in about one minute exposure into vats of nitric acid, resulting in a noxious brew that is the most poisonous material ever invented.

It is incompatible with creatures using DNA, such as human beings and everything else.

Transmutation is not a proven technology. And even if it partially worked, we'd still create vast new amounts of radioactive waste that would be hazardous for many centuries.

Our great, great, great, great, great grandchildren will still have to baby-sit it, even if everything that they're saying is true; all reactors, synthesized plutonium and other radioactive isotopes.

This technology was banned during the Ford administration due to concerns about proliferation of plutonium, the raw ingredient of nuclear weapons.

Dr. John Gofman who was assistant director of the DOE Livermore's lab in the '60's, says, quote "At least several hundred scientists trained in the biomedical aspect of atomic energy, myself definitely included, are candidates for Nuremberg-type trials for crimes against humanity for our gross negligence and irresponsibility." It's still true today.

In 1975, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission commissioned the Barton Report on intensified nuclear safeguards and civil liberties, which stated that during nuclear emergencies, normal civil liberties would have to be suspended, including torture and the, quote, "normal deterrent to such practices would be ineffective under the conditions of a nuclear emergency."

Oil and nuclear power have nothing in common. Oil runs transportation, not electricity.

In Hillsboro downstream of here, the country's largest solar panel factory is being installed. That is safe nuclear power. It has a 93 million mile evacuation zone. No closer please.

Solar and wind power does not poison

farmland. They do not make the ingredients for weapons of mass destruction or require a police state.

If we have any sense, we will use this as our energy future. And if this process is so safe, then remove the Price-Anderson Act, which prevents liability for nuclear contamination so that all people involved in the process are personally held liable.

Otherwise we would find that it would have been cheaper to make dynamite instead of nuclear bombs.

And relocalizing production, not more nuclear power, is the way to deal with the energy crisis.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

We are just a little more than halfway through, so for those of you who have signed up. We do have a lot of people.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How about the people on the Washington side, can they speak? Because we've got about 45 minutes until we have to go across the bridge.

MR. BROWN: I'm calling them in the order in which people have signed up.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. (Audience speaking over each other). We have to go home.

MR. BROWN: (Inaudible).

MR. DRESSER: I am the cofounder of Veterans for Peace in Eugene, Oregon. I'm also a psychologist. I'm very interested in communication.

And so I was looking at the GNEP's own literature here and the propaganda value or devalue therefore.

Quoting their own words here, they speak of technology that is proliferation resistent, not proliferation proof.

We have to have proliferation proof for anything involving radioactivity or nuclear energy.

They say that it is the only currently available technology capable of producing large amounts of power, quote, "without polluting the air." They don't mention the soil or the water, do they?

And it's currently -- it's the only technology currently available, because they haven't put any money into anything else.

So I ask them, are they the Department of Energy or are they the Department of Nuclear Energy?

They say their proposed technology makes it nearly impossible, not impossible, to divert these nuclear materials.

They've been at this cleanup process for at

least 20 years, a lot of people have said tonight. But I wanted to quote I read in the Tri-Cities Herald after the last meeting that we also attended.

Here's a guy who is a groundwater geologist for DOE. And they're concerned, of course, with the leakage in about a third of the 177 tanks, underground tanks there.

He says "We know we're at least close to one major source. If we can find the source, we can clean it up." I mean, they haven't even figured out where it's coming from yet.

The main thing I wanted to talk about as a veteran tonight though was something that has also not yet been mentioned in tonight which is depleted uranium.

I was rather amazed that somebody earlier said there's no military dimension to this. They don't produce depleted uranium at Hanford, but Hanford is proposed to be a whole part of a whole system that produces enormous amounts of depleted uranium.

I mean, 99.3 percent of the uranium that goes into processing after they extract the U235 which is fissionable is left over, it's depleted uranium.

What do they do with it? They give it away to weapons manufacturers. Now, somebody mentioned

tonight that --

MR. BROWN: Just make one more point please.

MR. DRESSER: Well, it's a little bit -- it's a pretty important point, please bear with me.

MR. BROWN: If you'd just make your final point, you can submit the rest of your comments in writing.

MR. DRESSER: The United States has dumped 2,200 tons of depleted uranium in Iraq. This is genocide. And it is an eternity of genocide with over a 4 billion year half life.

MR. BROWN: Thanks. Thanks very much. Madeline Smith will follow Dave Bybee.

MR. BYBEE: I want to acknowledge all the fear I've heard from people tonight from nuclear power that exists in the plant today.

All of it is antiquated technology. It was forced upon us by the Second World War in the desperation. It all precedes the space shuttle, which we're getting ready to retire.

I haven't discussed this much with these people tonight, but I believe what they're talking about is what's called fourth generation nuclear

technology, that's radically different from the point of what we have is polluting the rivers and stuff is low-energy neutrons, and they're trying to bring on line high-energy neutrons.

If you look at the power factor of nuclear compared to recycling renewables and you consider on the global basis, we have no source of power as humanity that is capable of being brought on line in the next 10, 15, 20 years that's going to supply the needs of the whole world, the nuclear.

The coal isn't going to do it. Renewables, wind energy, solar certainly isn't going to do it. So I would suggest that we give these guys a chance to participate, and the rest of the world, with Russia, China, France to develop a new technology with nuclear that doesn't have all the problems, that creates the fear that I see here tonight.

I've seen, felt the fear myself. I've had to dive under a desk whenever I was a child going to school.

But I've been in the technology. Part of my career was the designing, building with my own hands, and launching spacecraft.

I was present loading the Galileo spacecraft with the radioisotope nuclear generators.

And if you look at all the naval ships and the submarines we have right now, they're all nuclear powered.

You don't hear any problems about those things. And again, that's antiquated technology.

I'd like to charge these guys with the responsibility of whatever they come up with, with this global partnership, that it damn well better be safe. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: If you could hold off just a moment. We have, I guess, an unusual circumstance in this meeting that I haven't had to deal with before, which is I understand there's a bridge closing at 9:30. And the folks who have to go back across are going to have to leave.

We do have a number of people still signed up to speak. I'm wondering if the folks here in Oregon would be willing to let the Washington people take precedence and go ahead and speak.

MS. SMITH: Since I'm up here --

MR. BROWN: I'm not counting this against you. If you could hold on a moment.

May I have a show of hands of how many Washington people we've got? It looks like we've got about three or so.

So, Madeline, why don't you go ahead. I'll try to take the Washington folks. And I appreciate the hospitality of the Oregon people. Please go ahead.

MS. SMITH: My name's Madeline Smith. I'm retired. I'm a citizen. I live in Eugene.

I agree that we don't know how to clean up Hanford. But I want to talk about something else we don't know how to clean up. We don't know how to clean up the damaged sperm.

And this isn't only the women who are causing the damaged children at this point. There are so many toxins around that male sperm is being damaged. And we don't know how to clean that up either.

So when there's a charge of genocide, the more we do things to our -- negative things to our reproductive capacity, the more we make our future less possible to be. And I think that is a crime against humanity.

And I think it isn't only nuclear that we have to deal with, it's the whole chemical century that we've had, that has been an experiment that we did not vote for and that we are suffering the consequences of.

The failure to examine male mediation in the -- regarding damaged sperm might explain for an extraordinary high rates of couple infertility, miscarriage, birth defects, and congenital childhood illness and disease. Whose causes remain unknown.

Between 5 and 8 percent of all babies born in the United States have defects detectable at birth. 60 percent of all birth defects are of unknown origin.

And I think that's a horrible situation. And they have to clean that up. And not to enhance -- not letting Hanford proceed is how you start cleaning up our own bodies. And so be it.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. I think we have three Washington speakers. If you can just come forward.

MR. CURLEY: Hi. I'm Steve Curley. I live here in the gorge.

And it's about money. And it's about big money. I find it very interesting that most of the people speaking for this nuclear activity in the Tri-Cities area have a vested employment or monetary interest in the DOE or the economic benefit from the area.

As far as I'm concerned, you would shoot yourself in the foot to get a new pair of shoes. And

I do find it ridiculous. This is madness. It's utter madness.

I find it ridiculous that I have to give money to Heart of America to protect me from my government.

I have some chicken coop I just got in the back of my truck to put on my garden. It makes the garden grow very, very, very nicely.

Now, if I put -- can I put this toxic waste on my garden? No. Because you know what, nothing would grow for 200,000 years. 200,000 years. It's ridiculous.

This is the largest toxic waste dump in the western hemisphere. You know, why don't they store this waste where it was produced.

I bet if they did, all of a sudden they wouldn't be making so much waste anymore. And they'd understand how many people along the Columbia feel about being used as a toxic nuclear waste dump.

You know, someone earlier mentioned something about Mt. Saint Helens blowing up and the power of the explosion.

You know, it was very powerful. But you know what, it was not radioactive ash that fell all over this area.

I say let's put this Global Nuclear Energy Partnership waste in Crawford, Texas right next to George Bush's ranch.

Clean up what waste we already have made before we drop -- before we drop -- one more drop of toxic waste is trucked in.

France does have 70 percent --

MR. BROWN: One more point, please.

MR. CURLEY: It's a terrorist -- you're a terrorist threat that your enemy is in front of iosis (phonetic) is just the latest bogeyman. Just say no to the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Another Washington resident. I'll check your driver's license.

MR. BERGNER: Hi. I'm Dave Bergner. And I'm from Lyle, Washington. And I originally wasn't going to testify tonight, because I was worried about getting across the bridge, so I want to thank you for getting us get across the bridge.

Meanwhile, my first question really is why are we here. Okay. First of all, what I'm seeing is two states that don't want it.

So why didn't we ask the states first. Maybe we should have some states' right here. Maybe a

couple of referendums would also be in order.

Maybe a few alternatives would be good to consider like a study done by a consortium from the power industry - 15 years ago said that we could supply half the energy from the United States with just wind in North Dakota, with just the supply of wind energy from North Dakota. That would do the job.

Now, I've been an engineering teacher for most of my life. And I have two degrees in engineering.

And one of my instructors once said "One of the fundamental things you should do with an engineering problem is have a sense of the solution before you create the problem." We still don't have a solution, but we're creating another problem.

So I ask myself again, why are we here. And then I realized we stopped having welfare for the people, we just have welfare for the corporations.

This is a giant (audience applauding over speaker). We can truck the waste up the river, then we mess around with it, then we truck it down the river.

And guess what, we're trucking it using fossil fuels to avoid the use of fossil fuels. Why? Up the river, down the river, we pay for it.

And then maybe we'll need a few planes and a few guns and a few thousand soldiers to protect the waste. Wow. If that isn't welfare, what's welfare.

I'll give you the money, just take the money. Leave the fish alone. Leave the river alone. You want welfare, we'll create a beer factory for you, you guys can all work in a beer factory and make a hundred K a year.

This is nothing but welfare. This system is a giant giveaway. Thank you for your time.

MR. BROWN: Is anybody else from Washington? Okay. We'll be back to our regular order. Thank you. Gordon Sturrock. Is Gordon here?

MR. STURROCK: Right here.

MR. BROWN: Okay. And Susan Garrett Crowley will follow Gordon.

MR. STURROCK: My name is Gordon Sturrock. I'm a cofounder of Veterans Against Torture. And I couldn't help but think to myself if anybody else is feeling that we're just here talking to ourselves.

I love the idea of reducing nuclear waste. I love the idea of finding new sources of energy to replace the dirty ones that are causing global warming.

But I am very, very against this GNEP proposal. And I'll tell you why. I do not trust our government. I do not trust the Department of Energy. And I definitely do not trust the Bush administration.

How can we say that our goal is to reduce toxicity when we're shooting depleted uranium by the thousands of tons over in Iraq, sentencing the Iraqi people to an eternity of genocide.

That's what we're doing. One of the most serious war crimes ever committed by anyone.

This plan is nothing but a scam. It's a bait-and-switch scam, designed to hide the real intent which is to generate plutonium for the next generation of nuclear weapons called the reliable replacement warhead. Doesn't that make you feel good, reliable replacement warhead?

Don't you just hate it when your nuclear weapons don't go off when you want them to.

MR. BROWN: If you can make a final comment.

MR. STURROCK: Okay. I'm done. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

MR. BROWN: Susan will be followed by Rich McBride.

MS. GARRETT CROWLEY: My name is Susan Crowley. I live here in Hood River, here in the gorge. And I'm speaking in opposition to this plan.

As many speakers have already commented, this region, and Hanford in particular, have suffered more than their fair burden.

In many cases, there are already a few other parts of the country that have either begun to suffer the kind of nuclear burden that Hanford has.

It's been 60 years in the making. And Hanford has over and over again been the subject of some strange experiments by the Federal Government.

And not too long ago there was a plan, the energy plan for the area which proposed -- this was in the early '70's, late '60's, 22 nuclear plants for the region, for the northwest region.

And when that turned out to be not terribly workable politically, then they kind of wanted to concentrate as many as possible in the Hanford area, and this is the energy park concept that we heard about earlier this year.

And in Oregon, about 25 years ago, we actually stopped developing nuclear energy. And you folks may not remember this, but they stopped it because there was no place to store the waste. And

this was in 1980.

And I remember very, very clearly that all during that campaign, we kept hearing promises from the Federal Government, DOE representatives telling us that "Oh, maybe by '87 there would be permanent storage in nuclear waste."

And then as time went on, that deadline slipped to sometime in the '90's. And then it slipped to sometime in the early 2000's and even then 2001, and now it is where it is.

And this is just another harebrained scheme, it's another government scheme that's going to make Hanford its victim again, it seeks to make Hanford its victim again.

MR. BROWN: (Motioning).

MS. GARRETT CROWLEY: So that was my one-minute warning.

So, you know, and it's also been mentioned tonight, if Hanford is not already a terrorist target as a result of what's already there, it's already percolated into the aquifer, it certainly will be if there's anything like this kind of plan that gets developed.

Now, in the past, even though I've just said some unkind things about our government, I was

going through some old clippings today on a totally unrelated matter.

And I came up with this clipping from 1979. And the headline is U.S. Considered a Wastewater Lake at Hanford.

And apparently in the early '50's, the government was actually considering building a big lake and putting all the nuclear waste at that time in the war era, into the lake.

And lo and behold, in 1953 they issued an opinion that "Ah, you know, it might be a dumb idea. You know, there might be unforeseen consequences. The waste might percolate into the aquifer. I don't think we're going to do this."

And in 1953, they actually came to the right decision. And I'm hoping that once again they're going to come to a right decision and realize these are dumb ideas, they're not going to fly.

Let's just turn down your air conditioners; or better yet, turn them off. And conserve and not need to poison the air so we can have air conditioning. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Rich McBride, then Lloyd Marbet.

MR. MCBRIDE: I thank everyone who has

been here today and testified. I thank DOE for being here. So many good points have been made.

As far as transportation through the corridor of the Columbia River Gorge and increasing transportation of nuclear loads, I guess I've got one word: No.

As far as increasing jobs in our region having to do with nuclear power and putting the money in the hands of Bechtel and all these other corporations -- who I hardly ever hear about, but who seem to generate a lot of money, I wished I owned their stocked -- I'd like to say, no, that we don't want to do that.

We have a contaminated river already. We've been paying good money for quite a long time, waiting patiently for it to improve. It doesn't seem like it's happening.

I was married to a gal in 1978. She was an experimental drilling geologist in Yucca Mountain, Nevada.

They were doing speciality drilling on those salt domes in order to see how water moved through that area, see what happened.

So they couldn't use normal drilling mud, because it contaminated it with water. So they found

this super high-tech way to vacuum out all the drilling dust. Very expensive, we paid for all of that.

Her head engineer at the time said "They can talk about all these other areas they're talking about. In the end, there is only one place where our nuclear waste will go, that's Yucca Mountain."

We have made so many hurdles to that, now they're looking for another answer.

All we can do, folks, between now and the next two years is stall Department of Energy in any way that we can.

And the only other thing that we could do is impeach this president so that he can no longer bring these silly ideas to us.

MR. BROWN: If you could make one final point.

MR. MCBRIDE: We gave a lot of money to a large corporation to build name-the-nuclear-plant you would like.

We have given a lot of money to nearly these same corporations to clean up the mess. And they haven't done it yet.

And I am not stupid enough nor greedy enough to ask them to do it for me in the future.

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Steve Marbet, Chandra Radiance to follow.

MR. MARBET: It's not Steve.

MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. Lloyd.

MR. MARBET: There's an old adage which is often missed by those who deliberately choose to ignore the greater lessons of life: If you always do what you've always done, you'll always get what you've always gotten.

The history of nuclear power is replete with examples supporting this adage, but I do not need to repeat them here, since those testifying against this proposal have more than provided sufficient evidence.

What concerns me is how little we have learned from the mistakes we have already made; for once again, we are considering reprocessing nuclear waste in a world even more unstable than before.

It is bad enough that the present political administration is incapable of ending the catastrophic war in Iraq.

It is equally disturbing how it cannot end the war come home with nuclear power's civilian and military applications.

Instead, like the words of that song sung by Pete Seeger, we're doomed to be "Waste deep in the big muddy and the big fool says push on."

It always amazes me how you can witness significant events in history and yet fail to get the message, especially when it impacts your economic aspirations or threatens your global image.

A group of men, filled with hate, take over commercial airplanes. And instead of flying them into nuclear power plants, which they actually considered doing, fly them instead into twin towers that were not supposed to collapse.

We wake up in a world of terrorism. And now what we are proposing to do is build more nuclear plants, produce more nuclear waste, create more potential accidents and terrorist targets and through reprocessing (designed to prop up the continued operation of existing nuclear plants and its backed up nuclear waste) create even more weapons grade material for a world that competes preemptively to see who will self-destruct first. If this is addressing non-proliferation, then we're all in Alice's Wonderland.

Yes, I am willing to bet that none of these concerns, including its enumerable costs, will ever be

considered in any Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement that you create.

It is business as usual. And once again the train leaves the station, with all the blind spots passed on to the Department of Offense, there's no going back.

In fact, just like exit strategies, who wants to contemplate the failure we rush towards, even when there's a crowd of voices crying out from the wilderness.

We have lost faith in your ability to find any wisdom in this scoping process. But we have not lost faith in the hearts and minds of those who are no longer willing to put up with the Fustian bargain you present.

MR. BROWN: One minute.

MR. MARBET: I suggest that you carefully consider the idea of siting these nuclear installations in the Pacific Northwest.

Out here, we are not willing to settle for anything less than full accountability. We are only interested in building a world that is based on peace and justice, sweeping none under the rug, cleaning up, and putting a stop to these kinds of proposals.

By the way, there's copies of this on the

table, just in case anybody wanted something in writing.

MR. BROWN: Candice Radiance. Hafiz Heartsun will follow Candice.

MS. RADIANCE: I'm pretty nervous. And I didn't prepare anything very much beforehand, so -- but the truth is --

First of all, my name is Chandra Radiance. And I've lived here for 20 years. I've been coming to these meetings for 20 years, and I'm damn tired of it.

I would like to see this get resolved, cleaned up for once and for all and be able to enjoy the beauty of this area.

To choose to believe that reopening the FFTF reactor again and imputing waste through this bio-region is progress is absolutely insane.

One week ago, I returned from spending four months in one of the most politically, progressive, sane countries of New Zealand, who has a nuclear-free policy and also supports the Kyoto Protocol.

This country is leading the world in sustainable practices. And it's committing to be clean and green, implementing renewable energies.

And so if we think that we need to compete with the other countries to maintain our political ego

in nuclear proliferation, China is planning to build one nuclear reactor per week or something for the next 30 years. Is that progress?

I mean, what we're going to end up with is a world that doesn't even support life. It would be better to live without fuel than to contaminate the whole ecosystem of this planet.

Let's see. I have a close friend who died from radiation exposure as a welder at San Onofre Nuclear Power Plant.

And I've studied pathology. And I know that radiation is completely the most unsafe thing for humans.

I've been protesting against nuclear power for the last 30 years. And they still haven't found any way to safely dispose of the spent nuclear fuel. And I do not trust that they ever will.

I do not trust George Bush's idea to solve our energy demands by resorting to nuclear energy, by building more plants.

I don't trust that he's not doing this just -- or the regime that we're living under isn't having an ulterior motive for producing nuclear weapons.

MR. BROWN: If you could make just one

more point.

MS. RADIANCE: Okay. It's backwards-thinking, just like attacking Iraq because they had nuclear weapons supposedly.

I guess I just wanted to say that I believe the United States should be in compliance with its obligation under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, to commit to the global elimination of nuclear weapons no later than 2030, by initiating negotiations leading to conclusion of a verifiable treaty under strict and effective international control.

I also just want to say that if everybody would check into the fact that the sun is our greatest power source, and that technology does exist and has existed since pre Star Wars, back to the Carter era. It's called solar dishes.

Stirling Energy has proven track record that even a tiny percentage of the money that they're trying to allocate, a hundred or $200 billion for developing this GNEP, if only even a small percentage was allocated to developing this solar arrays in an area the size of Lake Powell, it would power the entire United States energy needs during all the daylight hours. And in conclusion, no nukes is good nukes.

MR. BROWN: Hafiz Heartsun is now and then Michael Pilarski will follow.

MR. HEARTSUN: Okay. Thank you. In addition to the comments that have been made about nuclear power, I'd just like to add that I don't trust the nuclear industry worldwide very much. I don't feel like they've lived up to their promises.

Toxicity is one point that it is the most toxic substance in the world. And they've tried to contain it, but there's been many accidents. And there's no assurance that these won't continue to happen.

On the element of transportation and terrorism, I think that's a major issue that I think could have been brought up in the information, that there is known quantities of highly toxic materials that they're proposing to transport.

You know, whether it's ten trucks or a thousand trucks. Sure, they don't know yet. But we know they're going to be transporting certainly a toxic amount, which is like do we even want one of these to break ever and contaminate anyplace in our country.

And do we realize how simple that could be to turn over a truck, to throw a simple stick of

dynamite, shoot out a tire. High-jack it from the driver and drive it over a cliff.

And even putting aside acts of terrorism and security, there's human error. Truck drivers drive off the roads and break their loads every day.

I can't understand how you want to take these highly toxic things, which are worse than the most dirty bomb that any terrorist could conceive of and drive them up and down our roads, waiting for one to break somewhere.

Do we want that to happen anywhere in our country, anytime even once? No. It's preposterous.

And also I want to underline what Chandra spoke to, about Stirling Energy. That this is a technology that's been available -- this was invented in the 1800's.

This is steam-age technology, that can easily -- much simpler and less toxic, even than solar panels.

It's a simple heat engine that converts solar power to electricity very simply. And it could provide all our needs without toxic waste.

And the only reason I believe this is going on is because it feeds a lot of rich people's pockets. And that's the only reason it's being continued.

And they're going through all the gyrations, trying to make it look good, when really it's just about lining their own pockets and keeping the current system in place.

We could do this very simply if there was just the political will and people were willing to give up their billions of dollars. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

MR. PILARSKI: Well, the good news is I'm one of the last speakers. And I think it's great that people get together and listen to each other. And we need to do that a lot more in this country.

And so I think just people listening to each other is real important, even if you disagree with someone.

I'm here representing the constituency as the human race. And the issue of nuclear war and nuclear winter, would ensue around the world, could kill us all possibly or most or many of the whole human race.

And so nuclear war is one of our biggest problems as a possibility. And this proposal is to make more plutonium and more uranium for bombs.

And who has the most weapons of mass destruction in the world? We know who that is. Which

government in the world has the most weapons of mass destruction?

Who is the most rogue country in the world? Who is the most feared country in the world? Who is the most feared president in the world?

And it's kind of sad that we're letting our country go downhill like this. I watch the opinions of other people in other countries, and the opinion of the U.S. in other countries has been going downhill for decades.

It's gone downhill a lot in the last ten years. It's gone down even further in the last six. It's not looking good for the U.S. anymore.

And building more nuclear bombs is not going to help world opinion, nor is it going to help the world. So at any rate, I vote no.

MR. BROWN: Joe Skeahan who is next, and Jaimes Valdez.

MR. SKEAHAN: Hi. I come up here to vote no against the reopening the Hanford site. They haven't cleaned it up already.

And it just doesn't seem to make any sense to keep -- to make something new up there that doesn't -- on something that doesn't work already. I vote no.

MR. BROWN: Joy Spalding will follow Jaimes.

MR. VALDEZ: All right. Well, I'm Jaimes Valdez. I live here in Hood River.

And I guess that I'll add that I also have a degree in physics. So I feel like I have a basic understanding of this.

I also feel like I'm one of the younger people here in the audience here today. And I realize that I'm going to be dealing with the issues relating to Hanford and nuclear technology for much longer than probably the people who are making these decisions in Washington.

And so I'd like to specifically address a few issues that I see with the GNEP project. First of all, I'll say that, you know, I really like your use of logos, really like -- sort of a co-opting of the environmental message here.

I think this really is what they're looking, which is the entire world covered with radioactive waste (indicating).

If you look at the logo, it kind of encircles, it has a complete cycle all around the world. And so I think that's very clever, though maybe that's not the message you intended.

I'd also look at kind of the two premises of the GNEP program. First are the safety and the issue of proliferation.

According to the U.S. Union of Concerned Scientists, the statistics basically say that there's about 240 metric tons right now of weapons-grade plutonium, enough for about 40,000 nuclear weapons.

The reprocessing of just the U.S.'s nuclear waste through the process proposed by GNEP, would effectively triple the amount of weapons-grade plutonium available in the world. And so if that doesn't pose a risk to nuclear proliferation, I don't know what does.

And furthermore, if people think that really is a solution to controlling nuclear technology, then I feel that they are terribly delusional.

Additionally, I just think that the idea of transporting nuclear waste up and down the gorge intuitively and physically is a terrible idea. And I hope that the DOE addresses that.

And in general, the need for electricity and the desire to generate electricity through nuclear means I think is an inherently flawed long-term solution.

And I encourage Congress and DOE to instead of using money into research and development for GNEP, to instead direct that money into real, clean, renewable, domestic sources including geothermal, wind, solar, wave power.

And also critically improving the infrastructure transmission of BPA throughout the northwest so that these technologies can be put on the grid. And so I encourage that.

And in closing, I suggest a reduction of funding for the nuclear and military industrial complex and an increased funding for a renewable, distributed democratic energy system. So thank you all.

MR. BROWN: Joy Spalding is next. And Catherine Thomasson will follow Joy.

MS. SPALDING: Well, I'm Joy Spalding. And I speak for Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibilities. I'm a board member.

We've been hearing that Hanford is not an appropriate site for GNEP. We agree, it is not an appropriate site.

The current waste is leaching into the river and the groundwater.

And we know that the vitrification plant is

not designed to handle the extra waste that would be brought to Hanford. And it means that the high-level waste would remain as liquid. And that means it can leak.

As for transportation, which we have talked about, we agree that it's not going to be good for Oregon or the other states it may come through.

It would mean 2,000 shipments a year coming along the Oregon and other states routes. But we're concerned of course with Oregon and Washington.

And there won't necessary be markings on the trucks to indicate what is in the trucks. So we won't know where these trucks might be going through our roads.

We say that reprocessing is not recycling. And we don't think reprocessing at Hanford would be good for the health of Oregonians or Washingtonians.

MR. BROWN: Tom Shawe will follow Catherine.

MS. THOMASSON: And I thought I was last.

My name is Catherine Thomasson. I am the national president for Physicians for Social Responsibility. And so we represent our 30,000 members.

The United States should lead by example. It's the right and smart thing to do. We've been doing it for 30 years.

If we begin reprocessing again, other countries will be asking for reprocessing as well. Particularly those countries the State Department has for the last 30 years tried to keep them from doing so because of security risk.

Since we stopped reprocessing in response to India using the same technology to build nuclear weapons, no other nation has built a reprocessing plant.

Continuing down this path will also increase tensions between the countries who have and the ones who have not nuclear technology and will increase the nuclear technology in countries that do not provide adequate safeguards for it.

So the PEIS needs to include the cost of the use or accidental explosion of a nuclear weapon and its environmental impact because of the increase in nuclear weapons, theft, or use.

It should include the cost of a terrorist attack on a nuclear facility such as Hanford or any other, and the clean up that will be needed for that.

The reason that needs to include is because

the GAO has done two very wonderful studies that show the Nuclear Regulatory Commission does not currently have anywhere near adequate security to protect the plants we now have.

The security risks also includes a terrorist bomb at any major port and the cost it takes to screen the port containers that we don't even know how to do at this point, because the technologies, the two reprocessing technologies can easily be reversed. They are not proliferation resistent.

The PEIS also needs to include the statistically known costs, measurable environmental costs of the near mega tons we already have in the United States, the six nuclear plants that are currently leaking radioactive water in the United States now, because nuclear power plants will -- more of them will be rebuilt because of this technology.

So there is a lot that needs to be included when we look at the entire GNEP program.

And I concur with all the statements that we have the technology we need in true, clean, renewable energy.

And that those costs should be evaluated against the true cost of nuclear technology. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Is Don Shawe here? No. Okay. We'll go to Mark Capps. Stacey Shawe? No. John Hendry? Brian Bontem? No.

Carola Stepper? Keith Harding? Yeah, Keith is here, okay.

MR. HARDING: I've just been scratching down my notes here. A great deal has been said tonight, just tons of information.

I'd want to touch on something that maybe hasn't been as much. And it's dealing with homeland security.

In this world where there may be a terrorist behind every Bush - and freewheeling multinational corporation, and the vested interest media plays Americans like they are a 50 cent Kazoo, restarting Hanford is insane.

As many speakers before me have stated, and this is people with a vested interest in life, not in income from Hanford, have said the "nuclear" world is loaded with deadly problems. It's evident everywhere in the world.

Real homeland security, just to get the idea going, would include things like living within ecologically sustainable limits, with an eye to the legacy we are leaving for the 1,000th generation into

the future.

This was suggested by Thomas Jefferson in his first inaugural address in 1801, "Consider the impact on a thousands generations into the future."

That could be on order of 20,000 years or 25,000 years. It seemed today we don't think beyond the next political season or the next quarterly report.

Decentralized, clean energy sources. Things like the solar and title and small in-stream flow. And also energy conservation.

As some people have said tonight, it wouldn't take much cutback in our consumption to make a huge impact in the millions of barrels that we consume from around the world every day.

Develop systems and foods that are nontoxic. No item that is not food should go into our so-called food.

Things like partially hydrogenated vegetable oil are not food at all. I understand from chemists, for instance, that they're one molecule different than plastic. It shouldn't exist.

Just because we can do something, doesn't mean we should do something.

And then I'd like to bring up the Christian

element here. Right now Washington seems to be dominated by a flavor of Christianity that uses the theory of Armageddon and Rapture, which is only about 150 years old.

And what I would suggest is that we turn to the compassionate Christian side. And that would mean showering less affluent countries and people in the world with things like infrastructure, medical supplies, food, housing, clothing. Things they really need. As well as domestically.

MR. BROWN: If you could make just a few more points.

MR. HARDING: As far as I know, my friends and neighbors around here don't want any more nuclear development in our neighborhood or anyone else's neighborhood or backyard. Thanks.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

That actually brings us to the end for those who have signed up to speak.

So I want to thank everybody for their attendance, for your polite and considerate consideration of all the points of view. And we are officially adjourned. Thank you.

(9:30 p.m.)

* * *

STATE OF OREGON)
)
County of Umatilla)

I, Susanne Starkweather, do hereby certify that at the time and place heretofore mentioned in the caption of the foregoing matter, I was a Professional Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public for Oregon; that at said time and place I reported in stenotype all testimony adduced and proceedings had in the foregoing matter; that thereafter my notes were reduced to typewriting and that the foregoing transcript consisting of 136 pages is a true and correct transcript of all such testimony adduced and proceedings had and of the whole thereof.

Witness my hand at Pendleton, Oregon, on this 9th day of April, 2007.

Susanne Starkweather
Professional Court Reporter
Notary Public for Oregon
My commission expires: 12-21-2008